

Quantum Theory from Symmetries in a General Statistical Parameter Space.

Inge S. Helland *

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to show a connection between an extended theory of statistical experiments on the one hand and the foundation of quantum theory on the other hand. The main aspects of this extension are: One assumes a hyperparameter space Φ common to several potential experiments, and a basic symmetry group G associated with this space. The parameter θ_a of a single experiment, looked upon as a parametric function $\theta_a(\cdot)$ on Φ , is said to be permissible if G induces in a natural way a new group on the image space of the function. If this is not the case, it is arranged for by changing from G to a subgroup G_a . The Haar measure of this subgroup (confined to the spectrum; see below) is the preferred prior when the parameter is unknown. It is assumed that the hyperparameter itself can never be estimated, only a set of parametric functions. Model reduction is made by restricting the space of complex ‘wave’ functions, also regarded as functions on Φ , to an irreducible invariant subspace $\mathcal{M}$ under G . The spectrum of a parametric function is defined from natural group-theoretical and statistical considerations. We establish that a unique operator can be associated with every parametric functions $\theta_a(\cdot)$, and essentially all of the ordinary quantum theory formalism can be retrieved from these and a few related assumptions. In particular the concept of spectrum is consistent. The scope of the theory is illustrated on the one hand by the example of a spin 1/2 particle and a related EPR discussion, on the other hand by a simple macroscopic example.

Keywords and phrases: Quantum theory; Hilbert space; hyperparameter; irreducible invariant subspace; parametric function; parametric invariant space; permissible parameter; state; statistical experiment; symmetry group; transitive subgroup.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo, P.O.Box 1053 Blindern, N-0316 Oslo, Norway.
E-mail: ingeh@math.uio.no

1 Introduction

One general motivation behind this paper departs from the observation that several cultures exist, also in science, even related to something as objective as the use of quantitative methodology. A possible way to approach this difficulty may be to aim at some kind of partial synthesis between methodology traditions that have developed independently of each other, in the present case statistical theory and quantum theory. Such endeavour must necessarily have a long-term perspective, so, although several concrete results are obtained here - even to the extent that some sort of synthesis of the two disciplines may seem to be in sight - a solution to the basic philosophical problem of finding a general way to stay impartial in science can of course in no way be promised. Nevertheless, there is a hope that something general can in fact be learned from an investigation like this.

In Helland (1998a) it was argued tentatively that the basic principles of quantum mechanics in its usual Hilbert space formulation is consistent with an ordinary general statistical modelling framework which includes the following features: 1) For a given system one has the choice between several experiments that can be performed. 2) There is an unobservable hyperparameter ϕ which is common to all potential experiments. 3) There is a symmetry group G acting on $\Phi = \{\phi\}$. (In Helland, 1998a, the notation $\bar{G}$ was used, since G was reserved for the corresponding sample space group; in the present paper we will concentrate on parameter transformations, however, so we change notation.) 4) The functions $\theta_a(\phi)$, giving the parameter of experiment a , satisfy a natural permissibility condition as a function of the hyperparameter ϕ , namely: $\theta_a(\phi_1) = \theta_a(\phi_2)$ implies $\theta_a(g\phi_1) = \theta_a(g\phi_2)$ for all g .

We will show in this paper that in order to derive a version covering ordinary quantum mechanical systems from these assumptions, one has to include the case when the permissibility condition is not with respect to G , but only with respect to a subgroup G_a of G . In each experiment, we let G_a be the maximal subgroup for which θ_a is permissible. In the case where ϕ is unknown, this is expressed *relative to each experiment a* , namely by taking the Haar measure relative to G_a as a prior.

For statisticians it should be mentioned that even if the word prior is used here, we will not enter any discussion on Bayesian versus frequentist inference. In fact, as pointed out in Helland (1998b), the case with objective Haar prior is just the case where the two schools give similar results.

The arguments of Helland (1998a) were based on quantum logic, and gave therefore only an indirect construction of the Hilbert space in question. Here we will give a direct construction using group representation theory. The requirement that a statistical model should be narrow, is made concrete by requiring that the relevant Hilbert space subspace should be irreducible under G . A definition of the state of a system is in general based upon what is known about some given parameter,

which we sometimes will call parametric function to distinguish it clearly from single parameter values. (The parameter may be multidimensional, i.e., the case with several one-dimensional parameters is of course included). An operator corresponding to a parameter/ parametric function is found via a mathematical theorem, and this operator may then be used to derive the ordinary formula for probabilities and expectations.

If the main idea here is accepted, there seems to be room for further developments both within statistics and within physics; some tentative ideas follow.

For theoretical statistics: The present focus is very much on classes of probability measures where each class has a relatively small set of parameters. In many applications this can be complemented by a rather rich and useful theoretical platform focused on a large parameter space where only a few specific parametric functions are of direct interest. Sometimes this same parameter space can then be used in probability models for several potential experiments, perhaps also for single models conditioned in different ways. Of course, this is a much more complicated concept than the standard one, but one can compensate by paying less attention to the detailed properties of the probability distribution chosen. Ideas not far from this are in fact also discussed in good books in experimental design, like Box, Hunter and Hunter (1978) and in books and papers in data analysis by various authors.

The other specific feature of the models in this paper: a close link between probability models and symmetry groups, will be amply discussed below. Such a link was argued for by using purely statistical arguments in Helland (1998b). Another potentially important relation to statistics from the topic of this paper seem to be to the theory of design of experiment; see the use of group theory in papers like Bailey (1991), Bailey and Rowley (1990), and quite recently, McCullagh (2000).

For theoretical physics: As many others who try to look at quantum theory from the outside, I first of all miss simplicity of fundamental ideas. Although this definitively constitutes the standard theory with a huge literature and ample experimental support, it still seems to me to be difficult to accept as the *final* solution a theory that takes something as abstract as rays in a Hilbert space as its basic state concept, and where the relativistic generalizations have even more abstract foundations. Renouncing this foundation when no satisfying alternative exists, is of course impossible, but there do exist books on quantum theory that have a relatively open attitude towards foundational issues (Isham, 1995; Peres, 1993, and references there), and radically new foundations have at times been proposed.

As a contrast to the Hilbert space concept of state, the concept of symmetry, and hence of symmetry groups acting on some given space or set, is a very simple one, basically, but still a concept from which much interesting mathematics can be developed, and, as shown below, very much of the essential structure of quantum theory can be regained. Our aim is that one day a complete theoretical physical

platform shall emerge based on simple concepts like sets and symmetry groups, and that derived vector space concepts, for instance group representations, will be held for what they really are: extremely useful calculating tools, but - as shown in the examples below - not the only possible ones.

Also, the statisticians' attitude towards mathematical modelling of real phenomena is today somewhat different from what we find in theoretical physics: In statistics, nearly all models are approximations, and they always depend upon unknown, hypothetical parameters, whose value we can never determine completely, only find uncertain estimates of. Physicists seem to be more used to thinking of an absolute, objective world behind their endeavours. In the long run, we may perhaps have something to learn from each other.

Some physicists may feel that the discussion that follows is fairly abstract. I can only give two comments on this: First, the point of departure, models for statistical experiments, may be unfamiliar to physicists; however, for the present paper one does not really need much more from this than the fact that everything depends upon some space of unknown parameters. Secondly, the main mathematical work here is really to demonstrate that a version of the ordinary Hilbert space based quantum theory is indeed consistent with this framework.

The plan of the paper is as follows: We introduce some simple concepts based on set- and group-theory in Section 2. In Section 3 an equivalence is established between parameters and certain subspaces of a linear 'wave-function' space, and in Section 4 a kind of spectra of a parameter is defined from group-theoretical and statistical concepts. In Section 5 the basic concepts are illustrated on the example of a spin $1/2$ particle, and a short discussion of the EPR paradox is given. The relation between parameters (statistical theory) and 'wave functions' is made more concrete in Section 6, while the necessary background on statistical experiments is given in Section 7 and Section 8. Then Section 9 and Section 10 give a rather thorough discussion of the simplest type of experiments, those where the parameters of interest are permissible with respect to the underlying group. The quantum theoretical formulae for expectation and for change of state are established for this case, but should then probably be regarded as a complicated way of saying simple things. This discussion also leads to the rules for change of measure during a measurement. In Section 11 we give the first discussion of experiments with non-permissible parameters, and also give some technical results needed for the final discussion. Finally, in Section 12 and Section 13 we give the main results on comparing the two approaches to modelling and predicting experimental results. The rest of the paper consists of examples and discussion.

Related ideas, namely that symmetries should constitute the main foundation behind quantum theory, have recently been advocated in great detail from a physical point of view by Bohr and Ulfbeck (1995). The present paper aims at making such

ideas as precise as possible, which seems to make necessary a point of departure radically different from what is ordinary. However, by using various mathematical tools, most notably the representation theory of groups, the resulting formalism will in the end be very close to ordinary quantum theory.

We have followed the statistical custom of denoting the state variables of a system by greek letters, called parameters. Alternatively, we could have denoted the system variables by more physical symbols like x, p, s etc.. One could then argue that it follows from the arguments of this paper that quantum theory is close to what one can find from classical physics under symmetry assuming that information is restricted and that one has the choice between several complementary experiments. We have four reasons for not choosing this last notation, however. First, we want to have the possibility of distinguishing between system parameters and experimental values. Secondly, it is a very important point of the present theory that models should be reduced as much as possible. Thirdly, in certain situations it seems necessary to include the aspect that the notion of ‘state’ may depend on what is known about a system. Finally, we want to indicate that quantum theory not only is close to classical physics under the stated conditions; it is close to any system under such conditions. The characteristics that are specific both to classical physics and to quantum mechanics, namely a Hamiltonian and an ensuing dynamical temporal development, are just the issues that we will not address in this paper.

A summary of the theory may be found in Sections 12 and 13. The two examples in Section 5 and Section 14 may also serve to illustrate the theory. Here are, very briefly, some key concepts and results: Definition 1 gives the core definition of a permissible parameter; in Proposition 1 it is shown that this property can always be obtained by reducing the group. In Theorem 1 we see the first connection between space (quantum theory) and parameter (statistics); this is followed up in Theorem 2 with single functions and fixed parameter values; in Proposition 3 we see that Haar measure splits in a natural way when permissible parameters are observed. The Theorems A1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and Corollary 5 are all variants of the same theme: Parameters can be associated in a unique way by operators. The basic parameter reduction is introduced in Definition 6: The state space should be irreducibly invariant under the basic group. The spectrum is defined in an essentially simple way in Definition 7: The main thing is that the (hyper)parameter space is reduced in such a way that the state space is a parametric invariant space. This is shown to be equivalent to the ordinary definition of spectrum in Theorem 8. The results of Section 13 show that ordinary quantum theory is contained in the framework of the main body of this paper, and it is in fact equivalent with it if we make a few extra assumptions, most notably the reversibility of transition probabilities.

2 Basic framework.

Let Φ be any fixed set, thought of as containing the description of all features, known or unknown, of some isolated system, physical or otherwise. Let G be any fixed group of transformations of Φ . Such groups always exist, of course, if nothing else, it could be the set of all automorphisms on Φ , but in many cases we will think of a proper subgroup of that one, expressing some natural symmetry property of the system description.

Knowing the value of $\phi_1 \in \Phi$ will imply full knowledge of the system in all details. For reasonably complex systems it will be impossible to achieve such detailed knowledge; it is systems of this kind that are the objects of this paper. The most one then can hope for, is to get to know the value θ_1 of some function $\theta(\cdot)$ on Φ . In statistical investigations this situation is quite common, but it is seldom made explicit. A statistical experiment is in general designed to get information about some specific (perhaps multidimensional) parameter θ , and in the ideal case we can conclude after the experiment (if it has maximal accuracy) that this parameter has some specific value θ_1 . Such ideal experiments will play a great rôle in this paper; in fact the quantum mechanical literature is full of ideal experiments of this kind. We will, however, also discuss briefly the modifications needed to include experimental error.

Below we will frequently meet the situation where several such parametric functions can be defined, typically corresponding to different potential experiments on the same system. But the notion is wider; in statistical contexts it may also correspond to the same experiment conditioned in different ways, to different (non-orthogonal) factors in a factorial experiment, or to different choices of a set of contrasts in an analysis of variance experiment. A proper discussion of these issues belongs to the statistical literature, however. Perhaps it may be more appropriate to talk about different *questions* posed about a system in such cases than to talk about different experiments. As is well known from quantum mechanics, an experiment designed to determine the value of one parametric function ('variable') may make the determination of another parameter difficult or impossible. In my opinion, such cases of complementarity often occur in macroscopic contexts, also. I will come back to this issue later.

Now we will bind together in a new definition the two concepts discussed so far.

Definition 1.

*The parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ on Φ is said to be **permissible** with respect to G if we always have that $\theta(\phi_1) = \theta(\phi_2)$ implies $\theta(g\phi_1) = \theta(g\phi_2)$ for all $g \in G$.*

The first implication of this concept is that a new group $\tilde{G}$ can be introduced, a group of transformations $\tilde{g}$ on the image space Θ of the permissible parameter, where $\tilde{g}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{g}(\theta(\phi)) = \theta(g\phi).$$

(The simple proof is given both in Helland (1998a) and in Helland (1998b).) This may often imply that it is possible to change focus from the large space Φ with the big group G to the smaller space Θ with the simpler group $\tilde{G}$. Note that the mapping $g \rightarrow \tilde{g}$ is a homomorphism: $g_1 \rightarrow \tilde{g}_1$, $g_2 \rightarrow \tilde{g}_2$ imply $g_1^{-1} \rightarrow \tilde{g}_1^{-1}$ and $g_1 g_2 \rightarrow \tilde{g}_1 \tilde{g}_2$.

Secondly, this notion turns out to have implications in statistical inference theory, as shown in Helland (1998b) (, where the same notion is called invariantly estimable, to conform to statistical usage): Certain paradoxes in Bayesian inference are avoided when inference is confined to permissible parameters, best invariant estimators equal Bayesian estimators under Haar prior, and credibility sets (under Haar prior) and confidence sets coincide. Further results on Haar measures from the assumption of permissibility are derived in Section 9 below. We will also meet more permissibility results in the next section.

Typically, the parametric functions that correspond to quantum mechanical variables will not be permissible with respect to the basic group G . However, they can always be made permissible with respect to a smaller group.

Proposition 1.

Let G_a be the set of $g \in G$ such that for all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Phi$ we have that $\theta_a(\phi_1) = \theta_a(\phi_2)$ if and only if $\theta_a(g\phi_1) = \theta_a(g\phi_2)$. Then G_a is a subgroup of G , and the maximal one such that $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is permissible with respect to G_a .

Proof.

G_a contains the identity. Using the definition with ϕ_1, ϕ_2 replaced by $g_2\phi_1, g_2\phi_2$, it follows that $g_1 g_2 \in G_a$ when $g_1 \in G_a$ and $g_2 \in G_a$. Using the definition with ϕ_1, ϕ_2 replaced by $g^{-1}\phi_1, g^{-1}\phi_2$, it is clear that it includes inverses. It follows from the construction that it is maximal.

It will be useful later to consider the ordering of parametric functions:

Definition 2.

We say that $\theta^{(1)}(\cdot) \preceq \theta^{(2)}(\cdot)$ iff $\theta^{(1)}(\phi) = \psi(\theta^{(2)}(\phi))$ for some ψ . If $\theta^{(1)}(\cdot) \preceq \theta^{(2)}(\cdot)$ and $\theta^{(2)}(\cdot) \preceq \theta^{(1)}(\cdot)$ we say that the two parametric functions are equivalent.

Note that the basic hyperparametric set Φ might as well be replaced by any equivalent set. Note also that this set will be maximal under the ordering $\preceq$.

The following definitions are not all strictly necessary for the theory that follows, but they might serve to focus upon the situation under consideration.

Definition 3.

A **frame** is defined as any collection of parametric functions $\{\theta_a(\cdot); a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ such that the mapping $\phi \rightarrow (\theta_a(\phi); a \in \mathcal{A})$ can be inverted.

Since it will typically not be possible to perform (at the same time) experiments corresponding to all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, it does not follow from this that the hyperparameter ϕ can be recovered from experiments.

Typically, in a frame, all (or some) $\theta_a(\cdot)$ are nonpermissible with respect to G . Thus we need to know how to tackle such functions. We choose to introduce the weaker concept of consistency.

Definition 4.

(a) The frame $\{\theta_a(\cdot); a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is **consistent** if each $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is permissible with respect to a group G_a such that G is contained in the smallest group containing all G_a .

(b) The hyperparameter space Φ is consistent if it can be connected to an consistent frame.

In this paper, all frames and hyperparameter spaces under consideration will be assumed to be consistent. Furthermore, it will be assumed that the subgroups G_a have been chosen in a maximal way, which they can.

Definition 5.

Given a frame $\{\theta_a(\cdot); a \in \mathcal{A}\}$, a minimal hyperparameterspace is defined as a set Ψ of parameters $\psi = \psi(\phi)$, permissible with respect to G , such that each θ_a will be a permissible function of ψ , and such that $\psi(\cdot)$ is minimal with respect to this property under the ordering $\preceq$.

Definition 5 aims at reducing the parameter space as much as is possible. If $\Psi \neq \Phi$, it is completely certain that the points $\phi \in \Phi$ are impossible to recover from experiments; the most one can hope for, is information on $\psi = \psi(\phi)$. So in this meaning, only the space Ψ makes sense, not Φ . The function spaces constructed later can be carried out for Ψ as well. When experiments are performed, the minimal hyperparameter space may change in general.

The essence of all these definitions is that they make precise - in a setting with group symmetry and a set of parametric models - the quantum mechanical concept of complementarity. Different parametric functions may correspond to complementary aspects of reality. To get full information, we need to estimate all these parameters, which may be impossible with the same experimental units. As stressed already by Niels Bohr, this concept may be useful also in daily life and in a variety of sciences. Today, the concept is used for instance in psychology and in the social sciences, but its use in other natural sciences than physics is rather limited.

3 Function spaces, invariance and irreducibility.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be any linear space of real or complex functions on Φ . This may be thought of as the space of ‘wavefunctions’ in quantum mechanics. Later we will assume that the group G introduces an invariant measure (Haar measure) ν on Φ , and use as $\mathcal{H}$ the Hilbert space $L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ or a proper invariant subspace of this space, but no such special structure is needed for this section. It will be assumed, however, that $\mathcal{H}$ is closed under the regular representation $U_R(G) = \{U_R(g)\}$ of G on $\mathcal{H}$, defined by

$$U_R(g)f(\phi) = f(g^{-1}\phi). \quad (1)$$

In the $L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ -case this will be automatic, and the operators $U_R(g)$ can be checked to be unitary. In general, the mapping $g \rightarrow U_R(g)$ will be a homomorphism from G to the space of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Any subspace V of $\mathcal{H}$ which is closed under the operators $U_R(g)$ defined by (1), is called an invariant subspace.

A new class of permissibility-results will be of direct importance for the present paper: In a straightforward way an order-preserving link can be established between

the permissible parametric functions on Φ and the invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ under the regular group-representation corresponding to the group G . As mentioned in the previous section, many parameters of quantum mechanics will be non-permissible, but in that case the result below can be used with the group G replaced by its subgroup G_a , defined in Proposition 1. The significance of this result lies in the fact that correspondance is established between parametric functions (a concept of statistics) and linear spaces (a concept of quantum mechanics). Later, we will also introduce a correspondance between specific parameter values and single functions in $\mathcal{H}$.

Before proceeding it may be useful to look at the summary of group representation theory given in Appendix 1. As is well known, this theory is very useful for doing calculations in applied quantum mechanics, say in elementary particle theory. Here we will use the representation theory to study the foundation of quantum mechanics, much in the same way as it was used in Bohr and Ulfbeck (1995).

The first of the following results were also proved in Helland (1998a). In general an invariant subspace V of $\mathcal{H}$ is called irreducible if it does not contain any nontrivial invariant subspace.

Theorem 1.

(a) *For a given permissible parametric function $\theta(\cdot)$, the set $V = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : f(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi)) \text{ for some } \tilde{f}\}$ is a sub-space which is invariant under the regular representation U_R . In the L^2 -case the space will also be closed. The space V depends only on the equivalence class of parametric functions $\theta(\cdot)$. The invariant subspaces of this form will in the following be called **parametric** invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$.*

(b) *Every closed, invariant subspace V of a closed linear space $\mathcal{H}$ is contained in a parametric invariant space with $\theta(\cdot) = (u_i(\cdot); i = 1, \dots)$, a basis for V .*

(c) *Ordering of the parametric invariant subspaces under inclusion correspond to ordering of parametric functions under $\preceq$. The space V is irreducible within the class of parametric invariant spaces if and only if the corresponding permissible function $\theta(\cdot)$ is minimal with respect to the ordering $\preceq$. Nonequivalent minimal permissible functions correspond to irreducible parametric spaces with trivial intersection.*

Remark 1.

In statistical modelling it is crucial to use a parametrization such that θ is as small as possible with respect to the ordering $\preceq$ without losing information, otherwise redundancy problems such as collinearity will occur. In practice, this also relates to problems such as near collinearity, since every statistical model is an approximation. According to Theorem 1, this is equivalent to having the invariant space V as small

as possible. This point of view will be very useful later, where it will be used for arguing that the basic Hilbert space should be chosen small in this sense.

Remark 2.

It may seem that V is typically trivially embedded into a very large parametric invariant space in (b). However, look at the case where V is irreducibly invariant of dimension d . Then, by using the Clebsch-Gordan series for polynomial functions, and taking limits in general, one can show that the embedding space can be linearly spanned by the matrix elements of the representing matrix, thus has dimension at most d^2 .

Proof.

(a) Let $\theta(\cdot)$ be permissible and let $V = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : f(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))\}$ for some $\tilde{f}$. It is clear that this set of functions is closed under linear combinations. In the L^2 -case it is also closed under infinite sums that converge in L^2 -norm, implying that it is a closed space. If $f \in V$, then

$$U_R(g)f(\phi) = f(g^{-1}\phi) = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}^{-1}(\theta(\phi))),$$

so $U_R(g)f \in V$. Hence the space is invariant.

It follows directly from the definitions that $\theta(\cdot) \preceq \theta_1(\cdot)$ iff the corresponding subspaces satisfy $V \subseteq V_1$. In particular, equivalence of parameters implies equality of subspaces.

(b) Let $\{u_i(\cdot); i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a fixed orthonormal basis for V .

For fixed ϕ , it is convenient to regard $u(\phi) = (u_i(\phi); i = 1, 2, \dots)$ as a vector in l^2 . For each i and g we have that $u_i(g\phi) = U_R(g^{-1})u_i(\phi)$ as a function of ϕ is a vector in V , and can therefore be expressed in terms of basis functions: $u_i(g\phi) = \sum_j \dot{U}_{ij}(g)u_j(\phi)$, or $u(g\phi) = \dot{U}_R(g)[u(\phi)]$ for some operator $\dot{U}_R(g)$ on l^2 . From this last representation it follows that the vector function $\theta(\phi) = (u_i(\phi); i = 1, 2, \dots)$ is permissible.

Since $f(\phi) = a^\dagger u(\phi)$, it follows that all vectors $f \in V$ are functions of $u(\cdot)$, which is permissible. Thus V is contained in the invariant space corresponding to $\theta(\cdot)$.

(c) The first two statements follow directly from the definitions. Assume that two non-equivalent minimal permissible parameters θ_1 and θ_2 have spaces with nontrivial intersection V_0 . Then V_0 must be an invariant space in the ordinary sense, and can without loss of generality be assumed to be irreducible (again in the ordinary sense). Let it have basis $u_0(\cdot)$, and let the space corresponding to $\theta_i(\cdot)$ ($i = 1, 2$) have basis $(u_0(\cdot), u_i(\cdot))$. Then by (b) we have $\theta_i(\cdot) = \psi_i(u_0(\cdot), u_i(\cdot))$ for some function ψ_i . By

permissibility $u_i(g\phi) = \tilde{g}_i(u_i(\phi))$ for group elements in the three groups $\tilde{G}_0$, $\tilde{G}_1$ and $\tilde{G}_2$. Fix ϕ_0 and take $\bar{\theta}_i(\phi) = \psi_i(u_0(\phi), u_i(\phi_0))$. Then one can verify from the definition that these are permissible, and this contradicts the assumption that $\theta_1(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(\cdot)$ are minimal.

Corollary 1.

If V_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$) are parametric invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to the permissible parameters θ_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$), then $V = \bigcap V_i$ is a parametric invariant subspace if and only if the minimum of $\{\theta_i; i = 1, \dots, k\}$ with respect to the ordering $\preceq$, is a permissible parameter, and in the latter case this permissible parameter generates V .

Corollary 2.

Assume $f_0(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))$ for some permissible parameter θ . Assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is closed. Then the closure of $\{U_R(g)f_0; g \in G\}$ is an invariant set in $\mathcal{H}$ contained in and spanning an invariant subspace of the space V corresponding to $\theta(\cdot)$.

4 Minimal model and spectrum.

As already remarked, we will later regard the functions f as ‘wave functions’ in quantum mechanical models. However, already now we will, in agreement with Remark 1 above, introduce the following definition.

Definition 6.

A quantum mechanical model is called minimal under G if it is required that all functions f under consideration belong to some fixed G -invariant and G -irreducible space. We will from now on regard this fixed irreducible space as our basic space and denote it by $\mathcal{M}$.

In the case where $\mathcal{H}$ is an L^2 -space, we can and will always take $\mathcal{M}$ as a closed subspace. Everything that is said about $\mathcal{H}$ above, also apply to $\mathcal{M}$.

Note that it is not required that the space $\mathcal{M}$ should be a parametric invariant space; typically it will not be so. Hence we can not use directly the argument that a minimal model is narrow in a more conventional statistical sense. However, we shall have in mind the situation where we have several - typically non-permissible -

parametric functions $\{\theta_a; a \in \mathcal{A}\}$, and hence several subgroups G_a such that in each case θ_a is permissible with respect to G_a . Then we shall see below that it is possible to make each θ_a correspond to a parametric subspace $\mathcal{M}^a$ closely related to $\mathcal{M}$, namely by restricting the wave functions to a certain subset of Φ , the prespectrum of θ_a . Hence in this respect the model will be minimal also in the more conventional statistical sense.

First it is clear that there will always be a linear subspace V_a of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of functions of the form $f(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta_a(\phi))$. We will assume that this subspace is so large (under the ordering $\preceq$ defined above) that $V_a \supseteq \mathcal{M}$. It can be seen later that this corresponds to the wellknown quantum-mechanical concept of a maximal commuting set of operators. Since we in agreement with Definition 6 are only interested in functions in $\mathcal{M}$, we will then in effect replace V_a by $\mathcal{M}$, but then looked upon as a set of functions $\tilde{f}(\theta_a(\cdot))$, where typically the $\tilde{f}$'s are restricted to a proper subspace Q_a of those determining V_a .

We will need a general, simple result on restricting a transformation group to a subset.

Lemma 1.

Let G be a transformation group on a set Φ and let $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$. Let G_0 be the set of all $g \in G$ such that $g\phi_0 \in \Phi_0$ and $g^{-1}\phi_0 \in \Phi_0$ whenever $\phi_0 \in \Phi_0$. Then G_0 is a subgroup of G and the maximal such which is a transformation group on Φ_0 .

Proof.

This is easily verified.

One characteristic of quantum mechanics is that a variable connected to a bounded operator will have a discrete spectrum of possible values. In our treatment these variables correspond to parametric functions. It is possible that the following considerations in some way may be developed further to give an operator-free definition of the spectrum associated with a parameter.

Definition 7.

(a) *Let in general f be a function defined on a set Φ , and let Φ_0 be a subset of Φ . The function f restricted to Φ_0 is defined as equal to the equivalence class of functions f_0 such that $f_0(\phi) = f(\phi)$ for $\phi \in \Phi_0$. A representing function corresponding to f is any member of this equivalence class.*

(b) An 0-prespectrum Φ_a^0 of the parametric function $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is defined as a maximal subset of Φ such that for all $f(\cdot) \in V_a$, when restricted to Φ_a^0 there is a representing function f_0 which belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. An 0-spectrum Θ_a^0 of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is defined as $\theta_a(\Phi_a^0)$ for some 0-spectrum Φ_a^0 .

(c) Assume $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ with ν a probability measure (; for instance, Φ could be compact). Then the prespectrum Φ_a^* of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is defined as a 0-spectrum which minimizes $\sum_i \text{Var}(\eta(\phi) | \theta_a(\cdot) = \theta_a(\phi_1))$ for any square integrable η , where the variance is with respect to ν and the sum is over the 0-spectrum. The spectrum is defined as $\Theta_a^* = \Theta_a(\Phi_a^*)$.

The essence of this is that the space $\mathcal{M}$, when restricted to a 0-prespectrum is a parametric invariant subspace of the corresponding Hilbert space. The spectrum is just the 0-spectrum which minimizes unnecessary variance.

Straightforward considerations show that the prespectrum and spectrum, when defined in this way, exist. A crucial point is the following: If f_i is a restriction of some f from Φ to some Φ_i ($i = 1, 2$) and Φ_1 and Φ_2 are assumed disjoint, then $f_1 + f_2$ is a restriction of f to $\Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2$. However, the 0-spectrum is not unique in general, as shown in the next section. Later we will associate a unique operator A_a to a parametric function, and then we will show that the spectrum of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is unique (the prespectrum may be non-unique), is independent of η and is equal to the spectrum in the ordinary sense of the operator A_a corresponding to $\theta_a(\cdot)$.

In effect then, the spectrum of a parametric function can be defined from pure group-theoretical/ statistical considerations, without involving any operator. This seems to really open up the possibility of having a foundation of quantum theory only based upon set- and symmetry-concepts. When it comes to calculations, the operator will be useful, however.

Some simple results follow.

Proposition 2.

(a) If $\phi_1 \in \Phi_a^0$ and $g_a \in G_a$, then $g_a\phi_1 \in \Phi_a^0$. If $\theta_1 \in \Theta_a^0$ and $\tilde{g}_a \in \tilde{G}_a = \theta_a(G_a)$, then $\tilde{g}_a\theta_1 \in \Theta_a^0$. Thus each 0-spectrum must consist of an orbit or a set of orbits of $\tilde{G}_a$.

(b) The 0-spectra and in particular the spectrum of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ are the same when the hyperparameterspace is changed as in Definition 5.

Proof.

(a) The space $\mathcal{M}$ is invariant under $f(\cdot) \rightarrow f(g\cdot)$, in particular so for $g = g_a \in G_a$. Hence the definition of spectrum is invariant under $\phi_1 \rightarrow g_a\phi_1$.

(b) Easily verified.

Corollary 3.

Let $\mathcal{M}^a$ be the space of functions in $\mathcal{M}$ restricted to a prespectrum of $\theta_a(\cdot)$, and define $\mathcal{H}^a$ correspondingly. Then $\mathcal{M}^a$ is a G_a -invariant parametric subspace of $\mathcal{H}^a$. Furthermore, Φ_a^0 is a maximal subset of Φ with this property.

5 Spin 1/2 particles and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox.

As an example to illustrate the general theory of this paper, we give a nonstandard description of a spin 1/2 particle, a description which will turn out to be essentially equivalent to the one given by ordinary quantum theory.

Look first at the general angular momentum case. A hyperparameter ψ corresponding to this angular momentum may be defined as a vector in three dimensional space; the direction of the vector giving the spin axis, the norm the spinning speed. A natural associated group G will then be the group of rotations of this vector in $\mathcal{R}^3$ together with changes of the norm of the vector. With respect to this group one has two permissible functions $\psi \rightarrow \|\psi\|$ and $\psi \rightarrow \psi/\|\psi\|$. We consider the situation where parametric reduction by means of the last function has already been performed, so we will from now on look upon ψ as a unit vector, and the group G as the group of rotations of such a vector.

We may want to have a hyperparameter space on which G is transitive; then we extend it so that $\phi \in \Phi$ can describe the orientation of any fixed three-dimensional object, for instance described by the three Euler angles. Then let ψ be a fixed unit vector attached to this body. The nature of the solid body and the choice of ψ in it, do not matter. All these quantities - including ϕ and ψ - are at the outset model quantities, and hence unknown.

The most that we can hope to be able to measure, however, is the angular momentum component $\theta_a(\phi) = \|\psi\|\cos(\alpha)$ in some direction given by a unit vector a , where α is the angle between ψ and a . This measurement is a standard one using a Stern Gerlach device oriented in that direction. To be more precise, this device measures some quantity x whose distribution depends upon θ_a , so there is some possibility that some part of the parameter θ_a can be estimated from such a measurement. The rest of the (hyper-)parameter ϕ is obviously totally unavailable.

The function θ_a is easily seen to be non-permissible for fixed a . The natural way to make it permissible, is to restrict oneself to a subgroup G_a of G , which we always

may do. In the present case, the maximal possible choice of G_a is the group of rotations of the unit vector around the axis a together with a reflection in the plane perpendicular to a . (This is the group that takes the sets of the form $\theta_a = \text{const.}$ into themselves.)

This group has several orbits: For each $k \in (0, 1]$, one orbit is given by $\theta_a = k$ and $\theta_a = -k$; for $k = 1$ these are degenerated. In addition there is an orbit for $k = 0$.

The obvious problem with this setup from a statistical point of view is the following: The Stern Gerlach measurement can give only one of two values, say $x = -1$ or $x = +1$. How can we hope to estimate a continuous parameter $\theta_a \in [-1, 1]$ from that little information? The solution offered here is outside current statistical theory, but seems sound from an intuitive point of view: Restrict the values of θ_a for which inference shall be made to its spectrum as defined above.

To this end, take first the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\phi, \nu)$, where ν is the Haar measure of G on Φ . The group representation theory of the rotation group G is well known and described for instance in Hamermesh (1962). We will not go into details here, but choose one irreducible representation, the two-dimensional one corresponding to a spin 1/2 particle. (We may, and will, disregard the fact that this representation is double-valued.)

To begin with we may regard the irreducible invariant space $\mathcal{M}$ as some fixed abstract two-dimensional space, say with basis vectors $(1, 0)'$ and $(0, 1)'$, and where the representation group $U(\cdot)$ is the unitary group $SU(2)$ consisting of all complex unitary 2×2 matrices with unit determinant. One way to write these is

$$U(g) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}i\sigma_g} \text{ with } \sigma_g = g_1\sigma_x + g_2\sigma_y + g_3\sigma_z,$$

and where σ_x , σ_y and σ_z are the Pauli spin matrices

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The space $\mathcal{M}$ can next be taken as a subspace of $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ by replacing the basis vectors $(1, 0)'$ and $(0, 1)'$ with two fixed normalized functions $f_1(\phi)$ and $f_2(\phi)$. It is convenient to take these as orthogonal in the L^2 -norm. The basic requirement is that $\text{span}(f_1, f_2)$ shall be invariant under $\phi \rightarrow g\phi$.

In fact we will not need the details of this to find the 0-spectrum of the parameter $\theta_a(\cdot)$. It is enough to know that $\mathcal{M}$ is two-dimensional: First note that the parameter space Θ_a is $[-1, 1]$, and the corresponding group $\tilde{G}_a$ is just the set of reflections in 0. From Proposition 2(a), the spectrum must consist of sets of orbits of $\tilde{G}_a$, which are the pairs $\pm k$ for $k \in (0, 1]$ and $k = 0$, which of course also can be seen from the description of the orbits of G_a given above. (Incidentally, this part of the reasoning also holds for higher spin and angular momentum.)

In fact, for this example one may verify that any orbit pair $\pm k$ for $0 < k \leq 1$ gives a 0-spectrum. Using the spin-operator in the usual way we verify that the spectrum corresponds to $k = 1$. In this case it is also obvious from the situation that this is the 0-spectrum which minimizes unnecessary variance.

To make precise: The value of θ_a before the measurement is a continuous parameter as defined geometrically above. The values after measurement are restricted to take one of two possible values -1 and +1; let us call this θ_a^1 . For simplicity we consider an ideal measurement x , after which we then can take $\theta_a^1 = x$. The probability distribution of the outcome x of the Stern Gerlach experiment turns out to depend only upon θ_a as expected, and is given by

$$P(x = -1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \theta_a), \quad P(x = +1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \theta_a). \quad (2)$$

The standard quantum theoretical derivation of these formulae may be found in several textbooks; the most important part needed is given in Theorem 9 below. An alternative motivation can be found from a symmetry argument: Looking at a simple figure, we see that the two probabilities are proportional to the Lebesgue measure of the parts of the diameter along a determined by the division point corresponding to θ_a . It would be interesting if this observation could be used to give an operator-free derivation of (2).

Note that it follows from equation (2) that $E(x|\phi) = \frac{1}{2}\theta_a$, a result that will be needed below.

If ψ is unknown, we get from (2) that the unconditional distribution is simply given by

$$P(x = -1) = P(x = +1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

This is true whether we use a prior for ψ from G , from G_a or from its restriction to the spectrum. When discussing the EPR problem below, however, it does have an impact which of these groups we use to define a prior. The correct solution is then to refer to the measurement model that was actually used, hence use the reflection group as restricted to the spectrum ± 1 , hence probability 1/2 on each of these two values.

Consider then the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen situation (as modified by D. Bohm), where two particles previously have been together in a spin 0 state, so that they - in our notation - later have opposite spin-vectors ψ and $-\psi$. This situation has been very much discussed in the literature, where the focus often has been on the fact that one here gets correlated spin component measurements even at great distance.

This in itself is not really surprising, however, since the two particles have a common history. Correlation through a common history can be found in many instances also in large-scale statistics. A much more serious difficulty is that Bell's

inequalities preclude explanation of the correlations via ordinary hidden variable models.

But even this difficulty is solved by letting the prior depend on the choice of measurement as described above. Let an observer A measure the spin of one particle along a direction a , and at some distance from this, let another observer B measure the spin of the other particle along some direction b . Let u be the angle between the directions a and b .

Let us first describe the situation from the point of view of the observer A . The point is that his measurement will give *some* information on the previous value of ψ , which in principle can be recovered using a Bayesian argument. We will not need this argument, however; it is enough that the two measurements are correlated through a common ψ . This common ψ is not a physical (hidden) variable, though; it is a hidden parameter, and as such it has only meaning when coupled to the measurement model of one or the other observer.

As explained above, the observer A will have a prior on ψ given by a probability $1/2$ on $\theta_a = -1$ and a probability $1/2$ on $\theta_a = +1$, where θ_a is the cosinus of the angle between a and ϕ . This is equivalent to a prior on ψ with probability $1/2$ on each of a and $-a$. Let $b^\perp$ be a vector in the plane determined by a and b , perpendicular to b . Then, from the point of view of A , ψ will have a prior concentrated on $a = b\cos u + b^\perp\sin u$ and $-a$, so that the prior component of $-\psi$ along b will be $-\theta_a\cos(u)$, again taking two opposite values with equal probability. As before, $E(x_a) = E(x_b) = 0$, where x_a and x_b are the two measured spin components, and we find

$$E(x_ax_b) = E(E(x_ax_b|\psi)) = E(\theta_a \cdot (-\theta_a\cos(u))) = -\cos(u), \quad (3)$$

so that the correlation between the spin component measurements is $-\cos(u)$, the same answer as given by ordinary quantum theory calculations.

The above calculation was made from the point of view of A , using his prior. It is easily seen that the same answer is found from the point of view of B . It is crucial that the argument requires no action at a distance, contrary to what seems to be claimed even in recent papers discussing quantum entanglement (e.g., Buchanan, 1998).

A rather naive analogy could perhaps explain what in my view is going on here: Two persons A and B have grown up together and gone to school together, but later they loose contact. At some point they are then picked out for a certain psychological test together with some other people, and the results for A and B turn out to be correlated. This can of course be explained roughly by pointing at the common background, but pressed to go more into details, A gives his explanation and B gives a slightly different one. One can in fact easily imagine that the issue is so complicated

that there exists no detailed ‘objective’ explanation: only two complementary views exist. In the same way, the correlation in the EPR experiment can not be explained by some ‘objective’ hidden variable, but the two complementary priors are both consistent with the observed fact.

Related conclusions on the EPR-experiment were recently reached by Deutsch and Hayden (1999) using the Heisenberg picture to analyse quantum information. It may be of some interest to compare briefly these two approaches. Deutsch and Hayden make extensive use of the *cnot* operation which is a logical operation connected to the spin measurements. In particular, each of the two spin component measurements are associated with a cnot operator, which can be interpreted as described above. A crucial point, however, is that a third cnot operator is needed after the two measurements. This may be linked to a comparison of the result found by A and the result found by B , and is thus directly connected to the correlation found. From a statistical point of view, the usual model for a measurement is an interaction between two players: nature and the observer. In the present case it may to some extent be fruitful to introduce a related concept to describe the interplay between two observers with different priors. At least this may seem to be a way to make the argument of Deutsch and Hayden (1999) less formal, and thus making it reasonably close to the argument sketched above.

6 Hyperstates and hyperparameters.

While states of a system in statistical modelling are most naturally given by points ϕ_1 in some parameter space Φ , in quantum theory they are given as rays in some Hilbert space. We will choose here to represent the Hilbert space by $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$. The question is: Can one associate in a natural way a unique ray represented by a vector $f_{\phi_1} \in \mathcal{H}$ to every $\phi_1 \in \Phi$? A simple informal solution might be to let f_{ϕ_1} be $\delta(\phi - \phi_1)$, but this is an improper function, and does certainly not belong to $\mathcal{H}$. A much better solution is to make use of the group structure associated with the Hilbert space. We will assume here that the group G is exact and transitive, so that for any pair (ϕ_0, ϕ_1) there is exactly one $g \in G$ such that $\phi_1 = g\phi_0$. A more general discussion of the same concepts may be found in Perelomov (1986). A brief comment to the general situation will be given at the end of the Section, and for derived groups situations with non-transitivity will be common later. The main results here are:

Theorem 2.

Assume that the group G is exact and transitive on a parameter space Φ , and let $\{U_R(g)\}$ be its unitary regular representation on $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$.

(a) Fix $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\phi_0 \in \Phi$. There is then a homomorphism from the parameters $\phi_1 \in \Phi$ (with group elements g) to the set F of functions f_{ϕ_1} (with group elements $U_R(g)$) which is given by $f_{\phi_1}(\phi) = f_0(g_1^{-1}\phi)$ for $\phi_1 = g_1\phi_0$.

The set F is invariant under $\{U_R(g)\}$, and F is contained in and spanning the least invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ containing f_0 . The functions f_{ϕ_1} are unit vectors in $\mathcal{H}$. This homomorphism is an isomorphism if we assume that no nontrivial $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is a strictly periodic function.

(b) Let V_1 be an irreducible invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ of dimension larger than 1 such that $V_1 \cap F$ is non-trivial. Assume that no nontrivial subgroup of G has a representation of dimension 1 in V_1 . Then the vectors in $V_1 \cap F$ lie in different one-dimensional subspaces, and these span V_1 .

(c) There is a larger space $\Phi' \supseteq \Phi$ such that every one-dimensional subspace V_1 of $\mathcal{H}$ is a pure state in the sense that there is a $\phi' \in \Phi'$ that is mapped upon V_1 in the way described in (a). The group G can always be extended to a group G' such that Φ and $\Phi' \setminus \Phi$ are different (unions of) orbits for G' . For any such extension, and corresponding extension of Haar measure ν to ν' , we have that $\mathcal{H}$, extended by putting functions equal to 0 on $\Phi' \setminus \Phi$, is an invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}' = L^2(\Phi', \nu')$.

Proof.

(a) We have that

$$\begin{aligned} U_R(g)f_{\phi_1}(\phi) &= f_0(g_1^{-1}g^{-1}\phi) = \\ f_0((gg_1)^{-1}\phi) &= f_{g\phi_1}(\phi). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Assume that this homomorphism is not an isomorphism, so that $U_R(g_1)f_0 = U_R(g_2)f_0$ for some $g_1 \neq g_2$. Then $U_R(g)f_0 = f_0$ for $g = g_1g_2^{-1}$, hence $f_0(g^{-1}\phi) = f_0(\phi)$ for all ϕ . This is only possible if f_0 is strictly periodic. The rest is easy to prove. (Compare also Corollary 2.)

(b) The functions constructed above are of the form $f_{\phi_1}(\phi) = f_0(g_1^{-1}\phi)$ if $\phi_1 = g_1\phi_0$. Assume that two of these, say f_{ϕ_1} and f_{ϕ_2} lie in the same one-dimensional subspace. Then, by the linear independence of the basis vectors we get $U_R(g_2)f_0 = cU_R(g_1)f_0$ for some scalar $c \neq 1$, thus $U_R(g_1^{-1}g_2)f_0 = cf_0$. By taking norms, we find $|c| = 1$. Assume that c is a complex number different from 1. This implies that the cyclic group generated by $g = g_1^{-1}g_2$ has a onedimensional irreducible representation on the vector-space spanned by f_0 , which leads to a contradiction.

We note that as g_1 varies, $U_R(g_1)f_0 = f_{g_1\phi_0}$ span V_1 , since if it spanned a smaller space V_0 , this would be invariant under the representation.

(c) Take $\Phi' \setminus \Phi$ as the collection of unit vectors $f(\cdot)$ not contained in F , and let G' be any group on this set.

These results are essential for what we want to show in this paper: It is possible to establish a relationship between the concepts of theoretical statistics, based on unknown parameters in some parameter space, and the concepts of quantum theory, based on state vectors/ rays in a Hilbert space. When it comes to interpretation, it seems that the parameter concept is easier to understand in most cases, even though physicists over the time have developed much intuition related to the Hilbert space paradigm.

The construction of this Section is closely related to the theory of coherent states, which go back to Schrödinger and von Neumann, and which has been developed and applied in great generality recently, see Perelomov (1986). The simplest application is to the Heisenberg-Weyl group related to the coordinate and moment operators. Another relatively simple application is to the rotation group of three-dimensional space; a special case of this has already been discussed in Section 5.

In the above discussion we have for simplicity assumed that the basic group G is exact. In general, non-exact groups can be handled by defining the isotropy group G_0 as the set of g 's such that $f_0(g\phi) = f_0(\phi)$ (modulo a phase factor), and then replacing G by $G \setminus G_0$ in the definitions above. Typically, this option will be needed when we go to concrete applications. A related procedure may be used when we come to non-permissible parametric functions.

7 General statistical background.

The ordinary statistical framework for modelling experiments will be used: A sample space $\mathcal{X}$ listing the possible outcomes of the experiment, a σ -algebra (Boolean algebra) $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, giving the events to which probabilities can be assigned and a class $\{P^\theta\}$ of probability measures on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$. In statistics the parameter θ is usually thought of as the unknown quantity in the situation. The statistical concept of state of the system will then either be a fixed value of θ or a probability measure over the parameter space Θ .

Consistent with the above discussion, we add the following feature, which may be of value both in statistical theory and in quantum theory: In a given situation we may have the choice between several potential experiments, sometimes mutually exclusive. Let $a \in A$ index the possible experiments. Then the basic mathematical construct will be $\{(\mathcal{X}_a, \mathcal{F}_a, \{P_a^{\theta_a}; \theta_a \in \Theta_a\}); a \in A\}$. Though some may think that

this is a more elaborate construct than the ordinary Hilbert space basis of quantum theory, it has the advantage that each element has a concrete interpretation, and that it is essentially the same framework that is used in the analysis of macroscopic experiments in a large range of empirical disciplines.

As before, we assume that each θ_a is a function of some hyperparameter ϕ , varying over a space Φ . (in fact, by taking Φ large enough, this is no essential restriction) and make symmetry assumptions: Let G be a fixed symmetry group on Φ . It is assumed that the space Φ is closed under the transformations in G . Often the structure of the parameter space is such that there is a very natural choice of G : If Φ consists of only location and scale parameters, say, then the corresponding location and scale groups are used; if direction parameters are added, then this may make it natural to adjoin rotation group(s) and so on.

A group acting on some space Φ is said to be exact if there is at most one group element g transforming any given point ϕ_1 to any other point ϕ_2 . The group is transitive if there always is at least one such g . Nontransitiveness implies several orbits in the space Φ ; this corresponds to superselection rules, which can be tackled by taking each orbit separately. (This must not be confused with the nontransitivity of the subgroup G_a which was encountered in the previous sections, and will be further discussed later.) Non-exactness in an ordinary statistical setting was discussed in Helland (1998b).

Assume that the hyperparameterspace Φ is locally compact, has a right Haar measure ν with respect to G and satisfies weak requirements such that the space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ of complex square integrable functions on Φ is a separable Hilbert space. This will be the Hilbert space on which we will start our investigation of quantum theory. One should have in mind, however, that all separable Hilbert spaces are equivalent, so it is possible to think of a general, abstract Hilbert space. Later we will switch our attention to a fixed irreducible invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$.

8 Experiments.

Consider first the traditional statistical setting where one concentrates on one single experiment. Let x be some random variable of this experiment, and let G^* be the group on the sample space corresponding to G on the parameter space, so that $E^\phi(h(x)) = E^{g\phi}(h(g^*x))$ for any function h . This gives a natural homomorphism from G^* to G . Most of the physical literature concentrates on ideal experiments where one disregards experimental uncertainty, and thus the result x of the experiment defines new values of the parameter, a new state of the system. For such systems we can

disregard measurement values x and concentrate on parameters and hyperparameters. An important special case is when the experiment just consists of measuring a parameter $\theta(\phi)$. For the most part we can think of such highly informative experiments in this paper. To put things into a proper setting, however, we will briefly sketch some points from standard statistical theory, concentrating on the situation with an underlying symmetry group.

One very common purpose of an experiment is to estimate the unknown parameter value $\theta(\phi)$, say by some function of the data $\hat{\theta}(x)$. There is a considerable theory on how to choose $\hat{\theta}$ in some optimal way, see Lehmann (1983). The more formal approach to this problem is to define a loss function $l(\hat{\theta}(x); \theta(\phi))$, which gives the loss - expressed in some way depending upon the situation - when the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ is given. The choice of $\hat{\theta}$ is made by minimizing l .

It was shown in Helland (1998b) that this problem was considerably simplified when $\theta(\phi)$ was a permissible parameter, in particular certain classical paradoxes were avoided. Then it is also natural to concentrate on permissible estimators, satisfying the requirement that $\hat{\theta}(x_1) = \hat{\theta}(x_2)$ implies $\hat{\theta}(g^*x_1) = \hat{\theta}(g^*x_2)$ for all g^* .

Let l be a loss function satisfying the invariance requirement

$$l(\hat{\theta}(x); \theta(\phi)) = l(\hat{\theta}(g^*x); \theta(g\phi))$$

for all g^* . (This is equivalent to $l(\tilde{g}a, \tilde{g}b) = l(a, b)$, where $\tilde{g}$ is the group element induced by g on the image space of the permissible functions $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\theta}(\cdot)$.) Then, as in Helland (1998b), Corollary 9, we have that the expected loss is independent of the parameter ϕ and given by

$$E^\phi(l(\hat{\theta}(x); \theta(\phi))) = \int l(\hat{\theta}(x); \theta(\phi)) p^\phi(x) \nu(d\phi), \quad (5)$$

where ν is Haar measure, and the probability density $p^\phi(x)$ is normalized so that $\int p^\phi(x) \nu(d\phi) = 1$. The righthand side of (5) is independent of x . If the data group and/or the parameter group is nontransitive (superselection variables), the equation is taken conditionally on each orbit.

The consequence of this identity is that one can use standard tools to minimize the righthand side of (5). If $l = \|\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta(\phi)\|^2$ the solution is simply

$$\hat{\theta}(x) = \int \theta(\phi) p^\phi(x) \nu(d\phi) = \int \theta q^\theta(x) \tilde{\nu}(d\theta), \quad (6)$$

where $p^\phi(x) = q^{\theta(\phi)}(x)$ and $\tilde{\nu}$ is Haar measure on the image space of θ . This is thus the minimum loss solution, and it is also the so-called Bayes solution under Haar prior.

In other cases, one is interested in conclusions to the effect that the unknown parameter $\theta(\phi)$ belongs to a certain interval. When $\theta(\cdot)$ is permissible, the two basic

such interval types, confidence intervals and credibility intervals (again under Haar prior) coincide.

We will from now on assume that the experiment performed is ideal, in the sense that we arrive at a conclusion of the form $\theta(\phi) \in C$, or rather, even more ideally, $\theta(\phi) = \theta_1$ and that we consider this conclusion as certain. We may also consider statements of this form when they are not results of experiments, say, hypothetical statements in a discussion, or conclusions arrived at from other types of information.

9 An ideal experiment: measuring a permissible parameter.

In general, let $\theta(\cdot)$ be a permissible parametric function on a (hyper)parameter space Φ , subject to a group G . We may to begin with consider the specific values $\phi_1 \in \Phi$ as the pure (hyper-)states of the given system; a general hyperstate is then a measure over Φ . When there is no information about the system, a natural choice of measure is the Haar measure, in other cases the Haar measure over an orbit or over a set of orbits. Note that the Haar measure over an orbit is unique (up to a multiplicative constant); when several orbits are involved, each can be given an arbitrary weight.

By what has been discussed in Section 7, all this can be translated in a unique way to a set of rays (one-dimensional subspaces) in an invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$. The hyperparameter ϕ_1 corresponds to the ray generated by $f_{\phi_1}(\cdot) = f_0(g_1^{-1}\cdot)$ with $\phi_1 = g_1\phi_0$. The group elements g on Φ correspond to the unitary representation operators $U_R(g)$ on $\mathcal{H}$ by equation (4) in Section 7. The set of points in an orbit of G in Φ correspond to the set of one-dimensional subspaces represented by $\{U_R(g)f_{\phi_1}(\cdot); g \in G\}$. The situation we will have in mind in this paper, is that ϕ_1 is impossible to estimate directly; only certain functions $\theta(\phi_1)$ are available.

Let now $\theta(\cdot)$ describe the parameter of some particular experiment. Then, by Theorem 1, $\theta(\cdot)$ determines in a unique way a (parametric) invariant subspace V of $\mathcal{H}$. In the same way as in Theorem 2(a), the different values of $\theta_1 = \theta(\phi_1)$ can be associated with different functions of θ that are unit vectors of V when V is considered as a Hilbert space on its own right. Note that the different Hilbert spaces of this kind are consistent with the original $\mathcal{H}$, since Haar measure ν on Φ induces a new Haar measure $\tilde{\nu}$ on the image of the permissible parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ in such a way that

$$\int \tilde{f}(\theta)\tilde{\nu}(d\theta) = \int \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))\nu(d\phi).$$

We will start by discussing an ideal experiment in the parameter language, which is easiest conceptually, and then afterwards translate it to the vector space language.

Let the (mixed) hyperstate before the experiment is performed be given by a probability measure π on Φ . Let $\theta(\cdot)$ be the target parameter of the experiment, assumed to be permissible.

Suppose that the ideal experiment results in some value θ_0 for the target parameter. Let Φ_0 be a collection of ϕ -values such that $\theta(\phi) = \theta_0$. Then after the experiment, the basic group is changed to $G_0 = \{g : \theta(g\phi) = \theta(\phi), \forall \phi \in \Phi_0\}$, which is a subgroup of G by Helland (1998b), Proposition 5. The cosets gG_0 may be identified with the elements $\tilde{g}$ of the group $\tilde{G}$ of transformation of θ -values introduced earlier.

More generally, if $\Phi_\theta = \{\phi : \theta(\phi) = \theta\}$ and $G_\theta = \{h : \theta(h\phi) = \theta(\phi), \forall \phi \in \Phi_\theta\}$, with $\theta = \tilde{g}\theta_0$, then $\Phi_\theta = g\Phi_0$ and $G_\theta = gG_0g^{-1}$ (which is the same for all g that are mapped into the same $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{G}$). The sets Φ_θ , and also the cosets gG_0 will be disjoint for different $\tilde{g}$, but the groups G_θ will overlap. The intersection of all G_θ will be a normal subgroup K of G .

An important observation from the above results is:

Proposition 3.

(a) *Let the right and left Haar measure be equal. (For instance, the group could be compact.) Then the Haar measure ν' for Φ_θ with respect to G_θ is independent of $\tilde{g}$, and therefore of the value of θ .*

(b) *As a consequence, with θ as above, such that $\phi = (\theta, \phi')$ with $\phi' \in \Phi_\theta$, we have, $\nu(d\phi) = \tilde{\nu}(d\theta)\nu'(d\phi')$ after suitable normalization of the Haar measure on G , $\tilde{G}$ and G_θ , respectively.*

Thus in this sense the setting for new measurements is independent of the value of previous measurements. This result is crucially dependent upon the assumption that the parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ is permissible.

The fact that the analysis of consecutive measurements is relatively simple for permissible ideal measurements, can also be related to the following observation, already mentioned: If $\theta^{(1)}(\cdot)$ and $\theta^{(2)}(\cdot)$ both are permissible, then the compound parameter $\theta(\cdot) = (\theta^{(1)}(\cdot), \theta^{(2)}(\cdot))$ is also permissible. Thus results of the type above also apply for the compound parameter. The situation after the $\theta(\cdot)$ -measurement is the same whether $\theta^{(1)}(\cdot)$ is measured first or $\theta^{(2)}(\cdot)$ is measured first. A similar observation holds for more than two measurements. However, the probability distribution of $\theta^{(1)}$ will in general not be the same whether $\theta^{(2)}$ has been measured or not. In the ordinary language of quantum mechanics, we may have non-commuting variables also in this case.

Here is a tentative definition of a *state* of a system:

Definition 8.

A (permissible) state is specified by

1. *A permissible parametric function $\theta(\cdot)$ giving the focus of interest, or the quantity we choose to - and are able to - get information on.*
2. *A probability measure $\tilde{\pi}$ on the range of $\theta(\cdot)$. A special case is the complete specification $\theta(\phi) = \theta_1$.*

Note that this definition extends the previous definition of a (hyper-)state as a hyperparameter ϕ_1 or a measure over Φ . In the situation we have in mind, where it is impossible to get full information on ϕ , the states of Definition 8 are of more interest. It is an important observation that the pure states of this kind are in one-to-one correspondence with ‘wave functions’ of the form $f(\phi) = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}(\theta(\phi))$; see below.

In the situation mentioned above, when both $\theta^{(1)}$ and $\theta^{(2)}$ are permissible, a state described by the product measure $\tilde{\pi}_1 \otimes \tilde{\nu}_2$, where $\tilde{\pi}_1$ might be degenerate and $\tilde{\nu}_2$ is Haar measure, is considered equivalent to just the measure $\tilde{\pi}_1$ on the range of $\theta^{(1)}(\cdot)$. A total non-informative state is just Haar measure on Φ .

If the parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ shall determine a state, it is often wise to try to make it as large as possible with respect to the ordering $\preceq$.

Now we will try to translate this to the vector space language. This may seem like a rather meaningless exercise when we already have simple formulae for everything of interest. But the point is that we want to make a link to the formal apparatus of quantum theory. By doing that in the present simple situation, we will also be able to transform this link to more complicated situations.

As the choice of a basic Hilbert space we take $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$.

We intend to focus on states, not on hyperstates. Then the relevant functions are those projected upon the space V as in Theorem 1.

In particular, this means that the parameter space is changed from Φ to Θ . Mathematically, it will be important now that the underlying function $\theta(\cdot)$ is permissible. It is this property which implies that it is possible to transfer a group symmetry from the first space to the second space.

The conditional expectation (in parameter space) is given by the projection from $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ to the invariant space V of functions $\tilde{f}(\theta(\cdot))$ (cf. Section 3). This

projection operator has the following mathematical description: It is the operator $P^{\theta(\cdot)}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$P^{\theta(\cdot)}f(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi)),$$

where $\tilde{f}(\theta)$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $f(\phi)\nu(d\phi)$ with respect to $\tilde{\nu}(d\theta)$, the Haar measure on the image space Θ of $\theta(\cdot)$. Explicitly, $\tilde{f}(\theta) = \int_{\Phi_\theta} f(\phi')\nu'(d\phi')$, since $\nu(d\phi) = \tilde{\nu}(d\theta)\nu'(d\phi')$ (assuming $\nu'(\Phi_\theta) = 1$). Thus $P^{\theta(\cdot)}$ smooths f over each single set Φ_θ ($\theta \in \Theta$), and is the correct operator if we want to change the parameter from ϕ to θ . In more statistical language $P^{\theta(\cdot)}f(\cdot)$ is the conditional expectation of $f(\cdot)$, given $\theta(\cdot)$, looked upon as random variables.

Theorem 3.

Assume Haar measure on Φ such that $\nu'(\Phi_\theta) = 1$. Then $P^{\theta(\cdot)}$ as described above is a projection operator, and projects upon the space V of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to the permissible parameter $\theta(\cdot)$.

Proof.

Let $f(\phi)\nu(d\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))\tilde{\nu}(d\theta)$. Then for any integrable function $c(\cdot)$ on Θ we have

$$\int c(\theta(\phi))f(\phi)\nu(d\phi) = \int c(\theta)\tilde{f}(\theta)\tilde{\nu}(d\theta).$$

Use this identity on $c(\theta) = g(\theta)^* - \tilde{f}(\theta)^*$ to find after some manipulation

$$\int |f(\phi) - g(\theta(\phi))|^2 \nu(d\phi) - \int |f(\phi) - \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))|^2 \nu(d\phi) = \int |g(\theta) - \tilde{f}(\theta)|^2 \tilde{\nu}(d\theta).$$

This shows that

$$\int |f(\phi) - \tilde{f}(\theta(\phi))|^2 \nu(d\phi) \leq \int |f(\phi) - g(\theta(\phi))|^2 \nu(d\phi)$$

for any g , so $P_\theta f(\cdot) = \tilde{f}(\theta(\cdot))$ is the projection of f upon V .

Recall that we consider a situation where the hyperparameter ϕ is unobservable, while certain parameters $\theta(\cdot)$ are observable. Also recall that $f_{\phi_1}(\cdot) = f_{\phi_0}(g^{-1}\cdot)$ for a fixed f_{ϕ_0} and $\phi_1 = g\phi_0$. For $\theta_0 = \theta(\phi_0)$ it is therefore natural to define

$$\tilde{f}_{\theta_0}(\theta(\phi)) = P^{\theta(\cdot)}f_{\phi_0}(\phi)$$

with $P^{\theta(\cdot)}$ as in Theorem 3. Note that $\tilde{f}_{\theta_0}$ is a unit vector in $L^2(\Theta, \tilde{\nu})$ when f_{ϕ_0} is a unit vector in $L^2(\Phi, \nu)$. Let $\tilde{U}_R(\cdot)$ be the regular representation of $\tilde{G}$ induced by U_R , such that $\tilde{U}_R(\tilde{g})\tilde{f}(\theta) = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}^{-1}\theta)$. Taking $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = \tilde{U}(\tilde{g})\tilde{f}_{\theta_0}$ for $\theta_1 = \tilde{g}\theta_0$ in a similar way as in (4), we get in a unique way $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = P^{\theta(\cdot)}f_{\phi_1}$ for $\theta_1 = \theta(\phi_1)$. Thus in the permissible case, in this sense a description in $L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ is equivalent to a description in $L^2(\Theta, \tilde{\nu})$.

Note that the mapping $g \rightarrow \tilde{g}$ is a homomorphism, so $g \rightarrow \tilde{U}(\tilde{g})$ also gives a representation (on V) of the basic group G .

10 Quantum operators for permissible experiment.

In accordance with ordinary quantum mechanics, it is natural to define the density ‘matrix’ ρ for the mixed state corresponding to a probability measure $\tilde{\pi}(\cdot)$ over Θ as

$$\rho = \int \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger \tilde{\pi}(d\theta_1), \text{ i.e., } \rho(\phi, \phi') = \int \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}(\theta(\phi))\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}(\theta(\phi'))^* \tilde{\pi}(d\theta_1). \quad (7)$$

This is consistent with the fact that $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}$ is a pure state vector corresponding to the parameter value θ_1 . An objection might be that these vectors are not orthogonal in general, so the corresponding projectors do not usually commute. Nevertheless, the integral is well defined and gives a trace 1 positive definite operator ρ as it should. By choosing new basis vectors that are orthogonal, it can be expressed in a more ordinary form. Similar constructions are made in the theory of coherent states; see Perelomov (1986).

Even though there thus is a parallel to ordinary quantum theory here, and more parallels will turn up later, there is also a formal difference: The definition of ρ depends crucially upon the choice of the function $\tilde{f}_{\theta_0}$ such that $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = \tilde{U}_R(\tilde{g}_1)\tilde{f}_{\theta_0}$, so this function must be held fixed. More precisely, for the formalism that we now are going to develop, one should fix once and for all a function $f_0(\phi) = f_{\phi_0}(\phi)$, and then project it upon the various spaces corresponding to permissible parameters as described above.

The next step is to try to find an operator corresponding to a new parameter of interest $\eta = \eta(\phi)$. A first attempt might be to define the ‘diagonal’ operator A_η by $A_\eta\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = E(\eta(\phi)|\theta = \theta_1)\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}$.

Here a problem arises, however: In general, this will not be well defined, again since the $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}$ ’s are non-orthogonal. However, what we can do, is to define A_η such that $A_\eta\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = E(\eta(\phi)|\theta = \theta_1)\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} + e_{\theta_1}$ with $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger e_{\theta_1} = 0$, where the conditional expectation assumes Haar measure on each Φ_θ .

A far more general result is given by the following theorem, which most certainly also can be generalized beyond the case of a compact group.

Theorem 4.

Let U_R be the regular representation of a compact group G on $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$. Fix $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $c(\cdot)$ be an integrable function on G . Assume that the projection $f_r = P_r f_0 \neq 0$ on each irreducible subspace V_r of $\mathcal{H}$ for which $\int c(g) U_r(g) \nu(g) \neq 0$, where $U_r(\cdot)$ is the blockdiagonal part of $U_R(\cdot)$ corresponding to V_r .

Then there is an operator A on $\mathcal{H}$, unique except on irreducible subspaces where $f_r = 0$, such that

$$(U_R(g) f_0)^\dagger A U_R(g) f_0 = c(g) \quad (8)$$

for all $g \in G$.

Proof

Let $U_r(\cdot)$ ($r = 1, 2, \dots$) be the blockdiagonal irreducible parts. Then it follows from Theorem A1 in Appendix 2 that a unique A_r can be found for each r such that $q_r = (U_r(g) f_r)^\dagger A_r U_r(g) f_r$ satisfies $\int q_r(g) U_r(g) \nu(dg) = \int c(g) U_r(g) \nu(dg)$. Theorem A1 was derived in a l^2 setting. The corresponding L^2 -result is derived straightforwardly via the connection $f(\cdot) = v^\dagger u(\cdot)$ for a basis $u(\cdot) = (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot), \dots)$.

By choosing A to be blockdiagonal with blocks A_r in the representation where U_R is blockdiagonal, it follows that the two sides of (8) have the same Fourier transforms, and hence must be equal. An application of Schur's first Lemma (Appendix 1.) shows that A cannot have any non-blockdiagonal contribution in this representation. Hence A is unique as stated.

An obvious remark is that Theorem 4 also is valid for $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = L^2(\Theta, \tilde{\nu})$, i.e., when the basic parameter is θ . Then $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g}) \tilde{f}_{\theta_0} = U(g) f_0 = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}$ with $\theta_1 = g\theta_0$. Let $\eta(\phi)$ be some general function of the hyperparameter. Then it follows from Theorem 4 that under weak conditions there exists an operator A_η such that

$$\tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger A_\eta \tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = E(\eta(\phi) | \theta = \theta_1) \quad (9)$$

for all θ_1 , where the expectation on the right hand side is with respect to Haar measure over the remaining parameters.

For a state defined by the parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ and a probability distribution $\tilde{\pi}(\cdot)$ over θ , hence by a density operator ρ , given by (7), we have

$$\int E(\eta | \theta) \tilde{\pi}(d\theta) = \text{tr}(A_\eta \rho). \quad (10)$$

This gives a well known quantum mechanical formula derived in an essentially classical setting.

It was said above that the state vector ρ was only defined uniquely modulo a fixed function. Looking at how the operator Q depends upon the choice of v in Theorem A1, we get a similar arbitrariness in the definition of A_η in each irreducible space. The result is that $\text{tr}(A_\eta \rho)$ is uniquely defined, first proved if the space is irreducible, then in general.

We will see later that the formula (10) can also be made to be valid in the non-permissible case, hence it is generally true in our approach to quantum mechanics. The formula can in general be derived from, and is hence equivalent to, a special case of it, where expectation here is replaced by probability. The corresponding quantum theory statement is considered to be an independent axiom of the theory, as recently pointed out by Deutsch (1999). Deutsch aims at deriving it from the other postulates of quantum theory, but his arguments are countered by Finkelstein (1999). In our approach this formula is automatically satisfied by the construction of the operator involved.

The same formula holds for expressing approximate expectation of random variables, and this variant of the formula may be potentially useful for statistical applications, in particular when we need to approximate models with many parameters.

Corollary 4.

Define the approximate expectation for a random variable X , with a distribution depending upon $\phi \in \Phi$ when $\theta(\phi) = \theta_1$ as

$$\tilde{E}_{\theta_1}(X) = \int_{\Phi_{\theta_1}} E_\phi(X) \nu'(d\phi').$$

Then (under the regularity condition of Theorem 4) there exists an operator A_X , independent of all parameters, such that

$$\tilde{E}_{\theta_1}(X) = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger A_X \tilde{f}_{\theta_1} \quad (11)$$

for all θ_1 ; or, if there is a prior $\tilde{\pi}(\cdot)$ on Θ , then

$$\tilde{E}(X) = \int E_\phi(X) \nu'(d\phi') \tilde{\pi}(d\theta) = \text{tr}(A_X \rho),$$

where ρ is given by equation (7). It is assumed that the measures ν' and $\tilde{\pi}$ are normalized to 1.

Let for fixed θ_1 , $P_{\theta_1}f$ be given by $E\{f(\phi)|\theta(\phi) = \theta_1\}$, where, as in Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, the probability measure on $\Phi_{\theta_1} = \{\phi : \theta(\phi) = \theta_1\}$ is given by Haar measure. Similarly, for $C \subset \Theta$, let P_θ^C be the operator which according to Theorem 4 is given by $f_{\phi_1}^\dagger P_\theta^C f_{\phi_1} = 1$ if $\theta(\phi_1) \in C$, otherwise 0.

Theorem 5.

Assume that Haar measure is used on each Φ_θ . Then $P[\theta \in C] = \text{tr}(\rho P_\theta^C)$ in the state given by (7), and also in the hyperstate given by $\rho = \int f_{\phi_1} f_{\phi_1}^\dagger \pi(d\phi_1)$.

If f is an integrable function, one can define $A_{f(\cdot)} = \int f(\phi) dP_\theta$. Then $E(f(\phi)) = \text{tr}(\rho A_{f(\cdot)})$ when the state is ρ . The operator $A_{f(\cdot)}$ will be hermitean if f is real, unitary if $f(\cdot)^* f(\cdot) = 1$.

Proof.

We can write $P_\theta^C = Q_\theta^C P^{\theta(\cdot)}$, where $\tilde{f}_{\theta_1} Q_\theta^C \tilde{f}_{\theta_1} = 1$ if $\theta_1 \in C$, otherwise 0 (cp. Theorem 4). We then have

$$\text{tr}(\rho P_\theta^C) = \text{tr} \int \tilde{f}_{\theta_1} \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger P_\theta^C \tilde{\pi}(d\theta_1) = \int \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^\dagger Q_\theta^C \tilde{f}_{\theta_1} \tilde{\pi}(d\theta_1) = \tilde{\pi}(C).$$

The proof for the hyperstate case is similar.

The last part follows by a suitable limit argument.

11 Non-permissible parameters; some preliminaries.

The setting is as before: There is a hyperparameter space Φ representing all (unknown) quantities in a given system, a group G acting on Φ , a Haar measure ν on Φ and the basic Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$. We will allow the hyperparameter space to have a rather arbitrary structure.

The general natural procedure when $\theta(\cdot)$ is non-permissible, is to reduce the group. It follows from Proposition 1 in Section 2 that this can always be done in such a way that $\theta(\cdot)$ becomes permissible with respect to the new group.

The following technical results may give some of the background needed in general for a proper discussion of non-permissible parameters:

Lemma 2.

Let $\{U(g); g \in G\}$ be a unitary representation of G on a vector space V . Let V_1 be a subspace of V , and define $G_1 = \{g \in G : U(g)v \in V_1 \text{ whenever } v \in V_1\}$. Then G_1 is a subgroup of G , and $\{U(g); g \in G_1\}$ is a representation of G_1 on V_1 .

Proof.

It is obvious that $g_1g_2 \in G_1$ when $g_1 \in G_1$ and $g_2 \in G_1$, since $U(g_1g_2) = U(g_1)U(g_2)$. Let $g \in G_1$. Note that V_1 is an invariant space for the set of unitary operators $\{U(g); g \in G_1\}$, and so we also have that $V_1^\perp$ is an invariant subspace. Suppose that $U(g^{-1})v$ has a component $v_2 \neq 0$ in $V_1^\perp$ for some $v \in V_1$. Then $U(g)^{-1}v = v_1 + v_2$ with $v_1 \in V_1$ and $v_2 \in V_1^\perp$, and $v = U(g)v_1 + U(g)v_2$. This last equation implies $U(g)v_2 \in V_1$, which gives a contradiction to the assumption that $v_2 \neq 0$ since $V_1^\perp$ is invariant. Therefore: $U(g^{-1})v \in V_1$ for $v \in V_1$, and $g^{-1} \in G_1$ for $g \in G_1$. Thus G_1 is a group.

It is clear that $\{U(g); g \in G_1\}$ gives a representation of G_1 on V_1 .

Proposition 4.

Let $\{U(g); g \in G\}$ be a unitary representation of G on a vector space V . Let $\dim(V) = k$ (possibly infinity).

Let $W_1 \oplus W_2 \oplus \dots$ be an arbitrary decomposition of V in orthogonal subspaces. Put $V_j = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_j$ for $1 \leq j < k$, and let $G_j = \{g \in G : U(g)v \in V_j \text{ when } v \in V_j\}$. Then:

- (a) $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq G$, and all G_j are subgroups of G .
- (b) $\{U(g); g \in G_j\}$ is a representation of G_j upon V_j .
- (c) If V_j is a parametric invariant space ($j = 1, 2, \dots$), corresponding to the permissible (with respect to G_j) parametric function $\theta_j(\cdot)$, then $\theta_1 \preceq \theta_2 \preceq \dots \preceq \phi$.

Proof.

Follows from Lemma 2 and Theorem 1.

This Proposition gives us a way to handle non-permissible parametric functions in concrete cases: Find a subgroup G_a of G so that the parameter is permissible with respect to G_a . This is always possible, and in many cases it is easy to find such a G_a . In general we can let G_a be the maximal group such that $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is permissible

with respect to G_a ; cf. Proposition 1. The procedure is to do all calculations as if this was the relevant group. Note first that ν also is a Haar measure with respect to G_a . Let U_a be the regular representation of G_a on $L^2(\Phi, \nu)$, and let V_a be the parametric invariant space with respect to G_a corresponding to the parameter $\theta_a(\cdot)$. Use Theorems 3, 4 and 5 with the reduced group. Using the construction of Proposition 4 on $\{V_a\}$, and letting $\{U(g)\}$ there be the regular representation, it is seen that the two definitions of G_a coincide.

The definition of a state (Definition 8) can also be generalized to the non-permissible case. Thus we redefine a state to be any parameter $\theta_a(\cdot)$ together with a fixed value for this parameter (pure state) or a probability measure (mixed state). A final precision is given by the following: To define a pure state in this way, we require that $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is so large with respect to the ordering $\preceq$ that the corresponding space V_a contains the state space $\mathcal{M}$.

The result of all this may be combined with what is found by using the original group G .

We need a generalization of Theorem 4, and formulate some consequences of this generalization.

Theorem 6.

Let V be any subspace of $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ which is invariant under the regular representation U_R of G . Let $f_0 \in V$ have non-zero projection upon every irreducible invariant subspace V_s of V . Let $c(g)$ be any ν -integrable function which can be expanded in terms of the matrix elements of the irreducible representations:

$$c(g) = \sum_{s,i,j} a_{s,ij} \dot{U}_{s,ij}(g^{-1}). \quad (12)$$

Assume $a_{s,ij} = 0$ for all s such that $V_s \cap V = \{0\}$. Then there is a unique operator A on V such that

$$(U_R(g)f_0)^\dagger A U_R(g)f_0 = c(g).$$

Proof

The irreducible representation matrices satisfy the orthogonality relations (Hamer-mesh, 1962)

$$d_r \int \dot{U}_{s,il}(g^{-1}) \dot{U}_{r,jm}(g) \nu(dg) = \delta_{rs} \delta_{ij} \delta_{lm}.$$

The relation (12) therefore implies

$$\int c(g) \dot{U}_{r,jm}(g) \nu(dg) = d_r a_{r,jm},$$

which vanishes when $V_r \cup V = \{0\}$. Therefore A can be defined as an operator on V .

It is now time to make an important simplification. Recall Remark 1 after Theorem 1, where it was said that for the purpose of accurate inference it is usually wise if possible to make the statistical model narrow in the sense that the parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ should be small with respect to the ordering $\preceq$. Also recall the definition 6 of a minimal model. In the following, we will assume such a minimal model, i.e., the basic space $\mathcal{M}$ will be assumed to be irreducible with respect to the group G .

The following theorem will be fundamental for the further development of the theory.

Theorem 7.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an irreducible invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ under the compact, transitive and exact group G . Fix $\phi_0 \in \Phi$, and let $f_0 \neq 0$ be a fixed element of $\mathcal{M}$. Define $f_{\phi_1} = U_R(g)f_0$ when $\phi_1 = g\phi_0$. Let $\theta(\cdot) = u(\cdot) = (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot), \dots)$, a basis for $\mathcal{M}$, and let q be a $\tilde{\nu}$ -integrable function on the range Θ of $\theta(\cdot)$. Then there is a unique operator A on $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$f_{\phi_1}^\dagger A f_{\phi_1} = q(\theta(\phi_1)) \quad \text{for all } \phi_1 \in \Phi.$$

Proof.

Since ϕ is assumed to be transitive and exact under G , there corresponds a unique g for each ϕ_1 such that $\phi_1 = g\phi_0$. We have to prove that c defined by $c(g) = q(\theta(g\phi_0))$ satisfies the equation (12) for fixed s corresponding to the irreducible space $\mathcal{M}$. But by Remark 2 following Theorem 1, the set of functions c satisfying (12) is just the set of elements in the parametric invariant space corresponding to the permissible parametric function $u(\cdot)$ (cf. also Theorem 1(b)).

12 A possible starting point for a conceptually simpler quantum theory.

We have now collected enough technical tools to develop the relation between what seems to be an intuitively simple theory for quantum phenomena, based on symmetry and statistical modelling concepts, and the traditional one, based on an abstract Hilbert space formulation.

For clarity we repeat the basic assumptions made: We let Φ be some general hyperparameter space, for which nothing is assumed in principle, but compactness was assumed for some of the technical results above. Let G be a group acting on Φ . A parameter $\theta(\cdot)$ on Φ is called permissible if $\theta(\phi_1) = \theta(\phi_2)$ implies $\theta(g\phi_1) = \theta(g\phi_2)$. Any permissible parametric function induces a group $\tilde{G}$ on the image space Θ , i.e., $\tilde{g}(\theta(\phi)) = \theta(g\phi)$.

We will assume here that the group G is transitive; superselection rules can be tackled by taking orbits separately.

Any statistical experiment a can be modelled by a class of probability measures indexed by some parameter θ_a . We will assume here that there is some well-defined setting where one has the choice between doing any one in a fixed class of experiments. We can then always assume that each θ_a is a function on the fixed hyperparameter space Φ .

A basic assumption of the theory is that the hyperparameter ϕ can not be estimated. On the other hand, it is assumed that each parameter θ_a can be estimated accurately from an ideal experiment.

This framework is in fact rich enough to give a very interesting theory for experiments. The theory for each single experiment is contained in existing statistical theory. The theory of a collection of possible experiments like this, seems to be new.

In addition to the assumptions above, it may be convenient to assume, as in Definition 3, that ϕ in principle can be recovered from all the potential values $\theta_a(\phi)$, and, as in Definition 4, that the basic group G is contained in the smallest group containing all G_a . However, neither of these assumptions are really essential.

For the technical results in this paper, we have made the further rather strong assumption that G , in addition to being transitive, is exact and compact. These assumptions can certainly be partly removed by going deeper into the mathematics; a start of that process was made in Helland (1998b), using among other things results of Varadarajan (1985). However, the point here is mainly to show that a connection can be made, at least in the simplest case. Note that the new theory in itself does not need these strong assumptions to make sense, but assumptions are needed to do calculations and to recover the ordinary quantum formulations.

The link to ordinary quantum mechanics is found by first considering vectors in $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$, where ν is Haar measure with respect to G . Invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ are spaces that are closed under the operations $f(\cdot) \rightarrow f(g\cdot)$. In particular, the subspace of functions $\tilde{f}(\theta(\cdot))$ is invariant when $\theta(\cdot)$ is permissible; such a subspace is called parametric invariant.

At least when G is compact, then by group representation theory, each invariant space can be decomposed into irreducible invariant spaces. In the following, we will fix one such irreducible invariant space $\mathcal{M}$ (under G), and take that as our basic Hilbert space. In the compact case, $\mathcal{M}$ will be finite-dimensional.

We will now assume that each $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is so large under the ordering $\preceq$ that the space $V_a = \{f : f(\phi) = \tilde{f}(\theta_a(\phi))\}$ contains $\mathcal{M}$. The space $\mathcal{M}$ then consists of a set of functions $q(\theta_a(\phi))$ for a linear space Q_a of functions q on Θ_a . At the same time it contains all linear combinations of the basis functions $u(\cdot) = (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot), \dots)$ of $\mathcal{M}$. From the conclusion of Theorem 7 we get

Corollary 5.

Assume that G is compact, exact and transitive. Then for all integrable functions $q \in Q_a$ there exists a unique operator A_a^q on $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$f_{\phi_1}^\dagger A_a^q f_{\phi_1} = q(\theta_a(\phi_1)) \quad (13)$$

for all $\phi_1 \in \Phi$.

Proof. This follows since $q(\theta_a(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{M}$, and hence is a linear function of the basis $u(\cdot)$.

Note that we here only have used Theorem 7 for linear functions of $u(\cdot)$, not the full potential of this basic result.

Without loss of generality we assume that Q_a contains the identity function; this can always be achieved by redefining $\theta_a(\cdot)$.

Definition 9.

The A -spectrum of the parametric function $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is the set of values θ_1 of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ for which one can find a function $f \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $A_a f = \theta_1 f$, where A_a is the operator of (13) with q being the identity.

Since A_a is a bounded operator on a finite-dimensional space, it has a finite spectrum $\{\theta_i\}$ and a corresponding orthonormal set of eigenfunctions $\{f_i\}$ spanning $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 8.

The A-spectrum of $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is equal to its spectrum as defined in Definition 7. In particular, it will always be a 0-spectrum, so $\mathcal{M}$, when correspondingly restricted will be a G_a -invariant parametric subspace of the restricted $\mathcal{H}$.

One consequence (Proposition 2a) is that the spectrum is conserved under transformations $\tilde{g}_a \in \tilde{G}_a$.

Proof.

We will first show that the A-spectrum is a 0-spectrum.

Assume first that the A-spectrum is non-degenerate. Let $p(\cdot) \in V_a$, so that by what has been assumed, $p(\phi) = q(\theta_a(\phi))$ for some q . Since G is transitive, the irreducible representation $D(\cdot)$ is transitive on $\mathcal{M}$. Fixing f_{θ_0} as one eigenvectors of A_a , we can therefore find $\phi_i = g_i \phi_0$ such that f_{ϕ_i} are the other eigenvectors of A_a . Since then $A_a f_{\phi_i} = \theta_i f_{\phi_i}$, it is clear that (13) holds with ϕ_1 replaced by ϕ_i and $A_a^q = q(A_a)$. Since this can be done for any q , the set Q_a when restricted to the spectrum is the set of all functions, so V_a restricted to the spectrum equals $\mathcal{M}$ restricted to the spectrum. Since the number of eigenvalues of A_a equals the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$, the spectrum is maximal in this respect, so by definition it is a 0-spectrum.

The degenerate case can be handled by a limiting argument.

We will now show that among all 0-spectra, the A-spectrum minimizes unnecessary variance. First we remark that $\text{Var} \eta(\phi) = \text{E}(\text{Var}(\eta(\phi)|\theta)) + \text{Var}(\text{E}(\eta(\phi)|\theta))$, so this is equivalent to the requirement that the last term, or more generally $\text{Var}(k(\theta))$ for an arbitrary function k is maximized for the A-spectrum.

Since any 0-spectrum leads to a basis for an invariant space (under G_a), the basis vectors f_i will be orthonormal, so $\sum_i f_i f_i^\dagger = I$. Let now $k(\theta)$ be a function on Θ_a^0 , and let $k(A_a)$, respectively $k_2(A_a)$ be the operators such that $f_i^\dagger k(A_a) f_i = k(\theta_i)$ and $f_i^\dagger k_2(A_a) f_i = k(\theta_i)^2$, respectively. By Schwarz' inequality

$$f_i k(A_a)^2 f_i \geq k(\theta_i)^2 = f_i^\dagger k_2(A_a) f_i$$

with equality if and only if the f_i 's are eigenvectors for $k(A_a)$, hence A_a (a slightly better precision on the choice of k could have been formulated here, but that is trivial and rather uninteresting). Therefore by a straightforward calculation the variance is maximized when the 0-spectrum is an A-spectrum. It is known that the A-spectrum is unique, so that means that the spectrum as defined in Definition 7 is unique.

13 The connection.

We have defined a state as the specification of the value θ_1 of a parametric function $\theta_a(\cdot)$. But by what has been said above, this is equivalent to specifying a ‘wave function’ $f(\phi) = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}(\theta_a(\phi))$, which is an eigenfunction of the corresponding operator A_a . In this respect the correspondence is complete. ‘Wave functions’ that are not eigenfunctions of *some* parametric function/ operator are hardly of interest in quantum mechanics.

Most of what has been said so far, except the concentration on the irreducible, invariant space $\mathcal{M}$, might be transferable to many experimental situations. We will now make three additional assumptions which lead to the specific formalism met in quantum theory.

First, we have already assumed that all observed values from an ideal measurement of a parameter $\theta_a(\cdot)$ belong to its spectrum. From what has just been shown, this seems a very plausible assumption from a purely statistical point of view: It just serves to concentrate values in such a way that $\mathcal{M}$ will serve as a parametric invariant space for $\theta_a(\cdot)$. In quantum mechanics one wants to go a step further: Only values in the spectrum have meaning.

Secondly, we make the reversibility assumption

$$P[\theta_a(\cdot) = \theta_1 | \theta_b(\cdot) = \theta'_2] = P[\theta_b(\cdot) = \theta'_2 | \theta_a(\cdot) = \theta_1]$$

for all choices $\theta_a(\cdot), \theta_b(\cdot), \theta_1, \theta'_2$.

Thirdly, we assume the following: For the pair of parameters $\theta_a(\cdot)$ and $\theta_b(\cdot)$ we can find orthonormal bases $\{f_{\theta_i}^a\}$ and $\{f_{\theta'_j}^b\}$ that the state space $\mathcal{M}$ is irreducible under the subgroup of G generated by permutations among the θ_i and among the θ'_j .

These assumptions are enough to recover the familiar transition formulae of quantum theory.

Theorem 9.

(a) We have

$$P[\theta_b(\cdot) = \theta'_2 | \theta_a(\cdot) = \theta_1] = (f_{\theta_1}^{a\dagger} f_{\theta'_2}^b)^2,$$

where θ_1 is in the spectrum of $\theta_a(\cdot)$, θ'_2 is in the spectrum of $\theta_b(\cdot)$, $f_{\theta_1}^a(\cdot) = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}^a(\theta_a(\cdot))$ is the eigenfunction corresponding to θ_1 and $f_{\theta'_2}^b(\cdot) = \tilde{f}_{\theta'_2}^b(\theta_b(\cdot))$ is the eigenfunction corresponding to θ'_2 .

(b) In (13) let $q(\theta_1) = E(\theta_b(\phi) | \theta_a(\phi) = \theta_1)$. Then the unique operator of the equation has the form $P_{\theta_1}^{a\dagger} A_b P_{\theta_1}^a$ where $P_{\theta_1}^a$ projects upon the space corresponding to

θ_1 and A_b is the same for every choice of parameter $\theta_a(\cdot)$. Hence

$$E(\theta_b(\phi)|\theta_a(\phi) = \theta_1) = f_{\theta_1}^{a\dagger} A_b f_{\theta_2}^a \quad (14)$$

holds for all pairs of parametric functions.

Proof.

(a) In a simpler notation we have to prove the following (again using (13)): Let $u_0, u_1, \dots$ be an orthonormal basis of some vector space, and let $v_0, v_1, \dots$ be another orthonormal basis of the same space. Assume that there are operators, each set summing to I , such that for all i, j we have

$$u_i^\dagger P_j u_i = v_j^\dagger Q_i v_j$$

(; this is the reversibility condition). Then this should imply that the only solution is $P_j = v_j v_j^\dagger$, $Q_i = u_i u_i^\dagger$.

It is clear that this is a solution; the problem is to prove that it is the only one. Assume that there is a second solution $P_j^* = P_j + E_j$, $Q_i^* = Q_i + F_i$. Then

$$u_i^\dagger E_j u_i = v_j^\dagger F_i v_j = 0$$

for all i, j . But this implies that for all members g of the group generated by permutations of the two set of indices we have

$$u_0^\dagger U(g)^\dagger E_0 U(g) u_0 = 0,$$

similarly for the other equation. By assumption 3 and Theorem A1, this implies $E_0 = 0$, similarly $E_j = 0$.

(b) By (a), we can take $A_b = \sum_j \theta'_j f_{\theta'_j} f_{\theta_j}^\dagger$ in (14). This means that $P_{\theta_1}^{a\dagger} A_b P_{\theta_1}^a$ is a solution in (13); by Theorem A1 it is the only solution.

Some of the familiar consequences of (14) are:

1. If A_b can be made diagonal with respect to some countable orthogonal basis system, then the conditional expectation of $\theta_b(\phi)$, and of any function of $\theta_b(\phi)$ can be given as if the probability of some eigenvalue was the squared norm of the component of the state vector along the corresponding eigenvector.

2. If $f_{\theta_1}^b$ is an eigenvector for A_b corresponding to eigenvalue λ , then the conditional expectation of this state is λ , and the conditional variance is 0, so $\theta_b = \lambda$ almost surely in the state $f_{\theta_1}^b$. This must be taken quite literally, since all we know in this state is the value θ_1 ; any knowledge of the underlying ϕ is assumed to be absolutely impossible.

Note: All this theory has been built upon a one-to-one correspondence between parameters $\theta(\cdot)$ and values θ_1 of such functions on the one hand and Hilbert state vectors $f_{\theta_1}(\theta(\cdot))$ on the other hand. This means that a pure state is simply a pair $(\theta(\cdot), \theta_1)$. If knowledge of the hyperparameter ϕ_1 was a possibility, then from a quantummechanical point of view a rather trivial theory would result. On the other hand, it is this situation which is closest to practically all current statistical applications. One can easily imagine large scale situation, too, where the notion of complementarity is relevant. We are quite convinced that the way of thinking here, using model groups and related model reductions may be useful also in statistical applications, but the apparatus that will be needed for this remains to be developed.

In quantum mechanical applications, the parameters $\theta(\cdot)$ seem to be very close to what Bohr and Ulfbeck (1995) call symmetry variables, while saying that these variables constitute the elements of physical reality.

14 A simple large-scale ‘quantum mechanical’ example.

Since we have shown that our approach gives a formalism that is essentially equivalent to the ordinary quantummechanically formalism, any standard example from quantum theory could have been used to illustrate our theory. Instead we will give a large scale example, using a group which is as simple as possible. More examples of direct physical relevance, using a related symmetry approach, can be found in Bohr and Ulfbeck (1995).

One of the simplest non-commutative groups is the group S_3 of permutations of 3 objects. Visually, it is the group of possible positions of a solid triangle under the constraint that the corners should touch 3 fixed points on a table, say. It has a two-dimensional representation discussed in many books in group theory and several books in quantum theory. The quantum theory book by Wolbarst (1977) is largely based on this group as a pedagogical example. The famous controversies around Marilyn vos Savant’s example with doors, goats and a car (see Morgan et al., 1991, and references there) can also be coupled to the non-commutativeness of the group S_3 .

We will identify the hyperparameter space Φ with the 6 elements of $G = S_3$: 1=ABC, 2=CAB, 3=BCA, 4=ACB, 5=CBA and 6=BAC, where we can picture the

letters as marking the corners of the triangle, read counter-clockwise with the first letter at the lower lefthand corner. We still think of a solid, physical triangle, and we may assume that it is painted white on one side, say, corresponding to the rotation permutations 1, 2 and 3, and black on the other side, corresponding to the reflections 4, 5 and 6.

In this case the two-dimensional representation of the group is not only a homomorphism, but an isomorphism (Wolbarst, 1977). Hence the permissible parameter corresponding to the two-dimensional representation (cp. Theorem 1) is just the identity in this case. There are 4 parametric functions of interest: $\theta_a(\cdot)$, $\theta_b(\cdot)$, $\theta_c(\cdot)$, whose values are the upper case letter at the corners a, b and c , respectively, and $\theta_0(\cdot)$, whose value is the colour of the triangle.

Proposition 4.

$\theta_0(\cdot)$ is a permissible parametric function, while $\theta_a(\cdot)$, $\theta_b(\cdot)$ and $\theta_c(\cdot)$ each are non-permissible.

Proof.

Let the group element which takes the ground position 1 to the position i as listed in the hyperparameter list above, be called g_i ($i = 1, \dots, 6$). Assume $\theta_0(\phi_1) = \theta_0(\phi_2)$, say black, for two hyperparameter values ϕ_1 and $\phi_2 = 1, 2, \dots, 6$. Then by simple inspection $\theta_0(g_i\phi_1) = \theta_0(g_i\phi_2) = \text{'black'}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and 'white' for $i = 4, 5, 6$. Hence θ_0 is permissible.

For the other functions it is enough to produce a counterexample. Here is one for θ_a : We have $\theta_a(1) = \theta_a(4) = A$, but $\theta_a(g_5 1) = \theta_a(5) = C$ and $\theta_a(g_5 4) = \theta_a(3) = B$.

The maximal reduced group corresponding to θ_a will consist of the identity together with a single reflection: $G_a = \{g_1, g_4\}$, which is transitive on $\Phi_a = \{1, 4\}$, the set of elements with $\theta_a = A$. With respect to this group the parameter θ_a will be permissible. The results for θ_b and θ_c are similar.

So far the terms 'parameter' and 'hyperparameter' have only been words, but now we intend to construct a large scale quantum system based on this solid triangle. To this end, place the triangle within a hollow nontransparent sphere in such a way that it can rotate freely around its center point, placed at the centre of the sphere. Let there first be 4 windows in the sphere, one at the north pole, where the colour facing up can be observed, and three equidistant windows along the equator, where

single corners of the triangle can be observed. We could also let the observations in each window be uncertain for some reason, but for simplicity we will again stick to ideal measurements in each window.

To make this correspond as well as possible to a quantummechanical system, we have to make some perfections on the sphere with its windows and solid triangle inside. We assume that we have some mechanisms to the following ends:

Before any measurements are made, the triangle rotates completely freely around its center point. Once an equatorial window is opened, there is some mechanism which draws the nearest corner to this window. After the measurement at this window is done, this particular corner is fixed, and the triangle rotates around the implied axis until a new equatorial measurement is done. The second measurement implies that the hold in the first corner loosens.

Once the top window is opened, the triangle flattens out to (the nearest) horizontal position, and it continues to rotate in this position until a new measurement is done.

We assume that the windows are ideal in the sense that they never provide more information than they are supposed to. We finally assume that it is impossible to open the sphere.

Note that each ‘observable’ $\theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c$ has three different values. In the state where $\theta_a = A$ has been observed, each of the observables θ_b and θ_c then has a probability of $1/2$ on each of the values B and C. If a θ_0 -measurement has been done, the next observation in an equatorial window will be essentially unaffected. Therefore the state of the system after two such observations, one in the top window and one in the horizontal window, is completely determined.

Note also the following feature related to the general theory: If only observation of the permissible observator θ_0 is allowed, this will be a rather trivial system, where every future observation is fixed after just one measurement

A ‘true’ quantum mechanical system will first be obtained if we close and seal the top window. Then the triangle is never at rest. Each measurement puts the system into a new state. In particular, the question of retrieving ϕ , the ‘true’ position of the triangle, from a measurement, is out of question.

Standard quantummechanical calculations can be carried out for this example, e.g., by choosing a three-dimensional basis where $\theta_a(\cdot)$ is diagonal in the sense that it can be associated with a diagonal 3×3 matrix A_{θ_a} . In this basis neither θ_b nor θ_c are diagonal. However, ordinary probability calculations are of course much easier to carry out in this case.

15 Concluding remarks.

In this paper we have confined the discussion to the parameter space of the experiment in question. Taking up again the idea from Section 2 of a set of potential experiments $\{\mathcal{X}_a, \mathcal{F}_a, \{P_a^\theta; \theta \in \Theta_a\}; a \in \mathcal{A}\}$, a related discussion would result if we introduce a symmetry group on $\mathcal{A}$. This discussion seems to be related to randomization theory, where group representations and invariant spaces have already proved to be of fundamental value (Bailey, 1991; Bailey and Rowley, 1990). An interesting question is if it is possible to combine these two approaches.

It is of course too early to say anything final about the value of the mathematical results discussed in this paper. However, personally, I feel that there is a possibility that results of this kind can help starting a process which eventually may shed new light upon several aspects in the interpretation of quantum physics and also perhaps upon more general issues related to modelling, observing and interpreting nature. If I am right in these assumptions, there seems to be room for and need for much further work in several directions, and I think that some of this work may call for cooperation between several disciplines, physicists, mathematicians, statisticians, philosophers, and perhaps also other specialists.

At least on an intuitive level, I feel that there are less philosophical difficulties implied if one should be able to develop a complete parameter interpretation of quantum physics than what is implied by the conventional interpretation. Issues like Schrödinger's cat become less problematic when everything is governed by models with hypothetical parameters instead of formalisms involving states that are assumed to be 'real' in some sense. Similar remarks may help to explain why the Kochen-Specker theorem (Isham, 1995) does not seem to represent a problem here.

However, the discussion around hidden variables is very relevant to the model discussed in this paper. If the present models shall describe something like the real quantum world, then it must be impossible by any means to get full information about ϕ_1 . Only certain derived parameters can be estimated. One question then might be if models involving action at a distance on the hyperparameters can be permitted, since no information is ever retrieved about these parameters. The discussion of Section 2 is relevant here.

Also, several other problems do exist, for instance: What models should be allowed in quantum physics? What models are reasonable? Are there ways to tackle ambiguity in the model choice? Again there are many details to be worked out, but it is quite obvious that symmetry considerations must be very important in governing model choice in this field.

In this paper I have not said anything about time development and the Hamiltonian. The issue was briefly touched upon in Helland (1998a).

Modelling involves information. It would be very interesting if some connections

could be found to classical themes like Maxwell's demon, to blackbody-radiation or to thermodynamics in general.

At first sight the models of this paper may seem too simple to explain the complicated world of quantum physics. A natural question, for instance, is: Where do we find the superposition of state vectors in these models? In fact, we do find it, for instance in equations of the type $P_{\theta_1} f_{\phi_1}(\phi) = \tilde{f}_{\theta_1}(\theta(\phi))$ used above, or more generally, whenever focus is changed from one parameter to another.

Griffiths'(1984) history approach is an important issue in current development of quantum physics. Closer connections here would definitely be of interest to study. Of special interest may be the connection between decoherence in quantum physics and randomization and other ways of deliberately ignoring information in statistics.

A theme that is not touched upon at all here, is generalization to relativistic systems. There are undoubtedly problems here demanding the skills of both physicists and mathematicians. But knowing that large parts of high energy physics is based upon group theory, even the most superficial thinking around this may point at possibilities for some kind of parametric modelling based on symmetry.

Calculation is another problem area that seems to lead to new possibilities if the theories in this paper are accepted. In some future one can think of both statistical techniques (Markov Chain Monte Carlo for instance) that may turn out to be useful in quantummechanical calculations, or one can investigate if in the large resource of highly developed quantummechanical calculating techniques there might be something that is useful for instance in Bayesian statistics.

Finally, again if the ideas here are accepted, there seems to be room for thinking through once again some concepts in statistical theory. But that is not a theme here.

As repeatedly said above, all these remarks assume that the main idea of this paper should be accepted, namely that there is a possibility of a common foundation, at least partly, for the two areas which today seem so far apart: Theoretical statistics and quantum theory. My own feeling is definitely that there seems to be such a possibility, and that the technical arguments in the main body of this paper may give some of the tools needed to find that possibility. Another very recent development which seems to point in the same direction, is the Fisher information approach (Frieden, 1995; see also Matthews, 1999) treating among other things the relation between Cramer-Rao's inequality in statistics and Heisenberg's inequality in quantum physics. The book by Frieden discusses largely problems that have not been touched upon here, however; on the other hand, no discussion of quantum theory is given there except for the treatment of the Schrödinger equation and its relativistic counterparts.

Aknowledgements

I am grateful to Chris Isham and Carsten Lütken for discussions, to Phil Dawid, Tore Schweder and Mervyn Stone for comments and to Lennart Bondesson, Richard Gill and Dag Tjøstheim for encouragements during the work with this paper.

References

- Bailey, R.A. (1991) Strata for randomized experiments. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* **53**, 27-78
- Bailey, R.A. and C.A. Rowley (1990) General balance and treatment permutations. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **127**, 183-225.
- Bell, J.S. (1966) On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447-452.
- Bohr, A. and O. Ulfbeck (1995) Primary manifestation of symmetry. Origin of quantal indeterminacy. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **67**, 1-35
- Box, G.E.P., W.G. Hunter and J.S. Hunter (1978) *Statistics for Experimenters*. Wiley, New York
- Buchanan, M. (1998) Why God plays dice. *New Scientist* **160**, No. 2148, 27-30
- Diaconis, P. (1988) *Group Representations in Probability and Statistics* IMS Lecture Notes. Monograph Series, Vol. 11, Hayward, California
- Deutsch, D. (1999) Quantum theory of probability and decisions. Preprint quant-ph/9906015. To appear in *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*
- Deutsch, D. and P. Hayden (1999) Information flow in entangled quantum systems. Preprint quant-ph/9906007
- Einstein, A., B. Podolsky and N. Rosen (1935) Can quantum-mechanical description of reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777-780
- Finkelstein, J. (1999) Quantum probability from decision theory? Preprint quant-ph/9907004
- Frieden, R. (1995) *Physics from Fisher Information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Griffiths, R.B. (1984) Consistent histories and the interpretation of quantum mechanics. *J. Statist. Phys.* **36**, 219-272
- Hamermesh, M. (1962) *Group Theory and its Application to Physical Problems*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts
- Helland, I.S. (1998a) Quantum mechanics from symmetry and statistical modelling. To appear in *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*
- Helland, I.S. (1998b) Statistical inference under a fixed symmetry group. Submitted to *Ann. Statistics*
- Hora, R.B. and R.J. Buehler (1966) Fiducial theory and invariant estimation. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37**, 643-656

- Isham, C.J. (1995) *Quantum Theory. Mathematical and Structural Foundation*. Imperial College Press. London
- James, G. and M. Liebeck (1993) *Representation and Characters of Groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Lehmann, E. (1983) *Theory of Point Estimation*. Springer, New York
- Matthews, R. (1999) I is the law. *New Scientist* **161**, No. 2171, 24-28
- McCullagh, P. (2000) Invariance and factorial models. To appear in *J. R. Statist. B* **62**
- Morgan, J.P., N.R. Chaganty, R.C. Dahiya and M.J. Doviak (1991) Let's make a deal: The player's dilemma. *The American Statistician* **45**, 284-289
- Perelomov, A. (1986) *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Peres, A. (1993) *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Serre, J.-P (1977) *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin
- Varadarajan, V.S. (1985). *Geometry of Quantum Theory*. Springer, New York
- Wolbarst, A.B. (1977) *Symmetry and Quantum Systems*. Van Nostrand, New York.

Appendix 1: Some group representation theory for compact groups.

In general, a matrix representation of a group is defined as a function D from the group to the set of (here complex) matrices satisfying $D(gh) = D(g)D(h)$ for all g and h . Any representation D and any fixed nonsingular matrix K of the same size can be used to construct another representation $S(g) = KD(g)K^{-1}$. If the group is compact (and also in some other cases), we can always find such an S of minimal block diagonal form, and at the same time we can take S to be unitary ($S(g)^\dagger S(g) = I$). If (and only if) the group is Abelian, each minimal block will be one-dimensional.

An important aspect of this reduction appears if we look upon the matrices as operators on a vector space: Then each collection of blocks gives an invariant vector space, and each single minimal block gives an irreducible invariant vector space. For compact groups, the irreducible invariant vector spaces will be finite-dimensional. The minimal matrices in the blocks are called irreducible representations of the group.

More generally, a class of operators $\{U(g); g \in G\}$ (where G is a group) on a, possibly infinite-dimensional, vector space is a representation if $U(gh) = U(g)U(h)$ for all g, h . A representation of a compact group has always a complete reduction in

minimal matrix representations as described above. (The theory of general groups is more complicated.) In particular, this holds for the unitary regular representation defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ by $U_R(g)f(\phi) = f(g^{-1}\phi)$. Here ν is the right Haar measure for G on Φ (defined by $\nu(Bg) = \nu(B)$ for all B, g).

Two useful results are Schur's lemmas:

(1) If D and D' are irreducible representations of different dimensions, and A is such that $D(g)A = AD'(g)$ for all g , then necessarily, $A = 0$.

(2) If D and D' are irreducible representations of the same dimension, and A is such that $D(g)A = AD'(g)$ for all g , then either D and D' are isomorphic or $A = 0$. If $D(g)A = AD(g)$ for all g , then necessarily $A = \lambda I$ for some scalar λ .

The character of a group representation is defined as $\chi(g) = \text{tr}(D(g))$. The characters of the minimal blocks $D_r(g)$ are the irreducible characters $\chi_r(g)$. These satisfy the orthogonality relations

$$\int \chi_r(g)^* \chi_{r'}(g) \nu(dg) = \delta_{rr'},$$

where ν is the Haar measure of the group (which can be uniquely defined as a probability measure for compact groups).

Let now $V \subseteq \mathcal{H} = L^2(\Phi, \nu)$ be an invariant vector space of the regular representation $U_R(g)$ of a compact group. The orthogonal projection upon the irreducible part V_r of V corresponding to $U_r(g)$ (dimension d_r) can then be computed as

$$P_r = d_r \int \chi_r(g)^* U_R(g) \nu(dg).$$

A Fourier transform corresponding to the representation $U_R(g)$ can be defined by taking

$$\hat{f}(U_r) = \int f(g) U_r(g) \nu(dg),$$

for each irreducible subrepresentation, and it can be inverted by

$$f(g) = \sum_r d_r \text{tr}(U_r(g^{-1}) \hat{f}(U_r)).$$

More on group representations can be found in Diaconis (1988), Hamermesh (1962), James and Liebeck (1993), Serre (1977) and Wolbarst (1977).

Any regular representation U_R on an L^2 -space can equivalently be defined on l^2 by letting $u(\cdot) = (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot), \dots)$ be a basis for L^2 and taking $(\dot{U}_R(g)v)^\dagger u(\cdot) = v^\dagger U_R(g)^\dagger u(\cdot) = v^\dagger u(g\cdot)$.

Appendix 2: The construction of an operator.

The following result is the basis for proving Theorem 4 and the theory in Sections 11 and 12:

Theorem A1.

Let $\dot{U}(\cdot)$ be a unitary irreducible representation of a compact group G on a vector space V , let $v \in V$ ($v \neq 0$), and let $c(\cdot)$ be a function on G which is integrable with respect to Haar measure ν for G . Then there exists a unique linear operator Q on V such that $c(g)$ and

$$q(g) = v^\dagger \dot{U}(g)^\dagger Q \dot{U}(g) v \quad (15)$$

have the same Fourier component corresponding to this space:

$$\int c(g) \dot{U}(g) \nu(g) = \int q(g) \dot{U}(g) \nu(g).$$

Proof.

With Haar measure ν , the Fourier transform of $c(\cdot)$ is

$$\hat{c}(\dot{U}) = \int c(g) \dot{U}(g) \nu(dg).$$

We want to prove

$$\hat{c}(\dot{U}) = v^\dagger \int \dot{U}(g)^\dagger Q \dot{U}(g) v \dot{U}(g) \nu(dg).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\hat{c}(\dot{U})_{kl} = \text{tr} Q \int \dot{U}(g) v v^\dagger \dot{U}(g)^\dagger \dot{U}(g)_{kl} \nu(dg);$$

hence

$$\hat{c}(\dot{U}) = \sum_{i,j} Q_{ij} D_{ij}, \quad (16)$$

where, for each (i, j) the operator D_{ij} is defined by

$$D_{ij} = \int (\dot{U}(g) v)_i^* (\dot{U}(g) v)_j \dot{U}(g) \nu(dg).$$

We want to show that this equation has a unique solution. For compact groups, every irreducible representation is finite. Hence, taking components and using double indices, (16) is a matrix equation of the form $Tx = c$, which has a unique solution

for all c iff the adjoint equation $T^\dagger x = c$ has a unique solution for all c , and this happens if and only if $T^\dagger y = 0$ implies $y = 0$.

Assume then that (16) does not have a unique solution. Then there exists a nontrivial set of constants $\{c_{kl}\}$ such that

$$\int r(g) \dot{U}(g) v v^\dagger \dot{U}(g)^\dagger \nu(dg) = 0 \text{ for } r(g) = \sum_{k,l} c_{kl} \dot{U}_{kl}(g). \quad (17)$$

From (17) for a fixed $v \in V$ it follows that

$$\int r(g) \dot{U}(g) a b^\dagger \dot{U}(g)^\dagger \nu(dg) = 0, \quad (18)$$

first for $a = \dot{U}(g_a)v$, $b = \dot{U}(g_b)v$ by multiplying (17) by suitable $\dot{U}$ -matrices on both sides, then for linear combinations of such terms, and hence for all $a, b \in V$, since these linear combinations span V by Theorem 2(b).

Then, by letting a and b be basis vectors in V and multiplying both sides by another set of basis vectors, it follows that

$$\int r(g) \dot{U}_{ij}(g) \dot{U}_{kl}(g) \nu(dg) = 0$$

for all i, j, k, l . We now use the fact that the Fourier transform can be uniquely inverted. This first gives $r(g) \dot{U}_{ij}(g) = 0$ for all i, j , from which it follows that $r(g) = 0$. The irreducible representations of a compact group satisfy orthogonality relations of the form $d \int \dot{U}_{kl}(g) \dot{U}_{mn}(g) \nu(dg) = \delta_{lm} \delta_{kn}$ (cf. Hamermesh, 1962). Hence it follows from the definition (17) that $c_{ij} \equiv 0$. This proves the existence and the uniqueness of the solution of (15) for integrable $c(\cdot)$.